

**DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND
HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION, AND RE-
LATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS FOR
FISCAL YEAR 2006**

MONDAY, JULY 11, 2005

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met at 11 a.m., in room SD-192, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. Arlen Specter (chairman) presiding.

Present: Senators Specter, Stevens, Inouye, and Durbin.

CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

STATEMENT OF KENNETH Y. TOMLINSON, CHAIRMAN, BOARD OF DIRECTORS

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR ARLEN SPECTER

Senator SPECTER. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. The hour of 11 o'clock having arrived, the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health, Human Services, and Education will now proceed. This morning's hearing will focus on the funding for public broadcasting. The subcommittee is now in the final phases of preparing our submission to the full committee, which will be done later this week, and I thought it would be useful to consider the issue which has received public attention as to the appropriate level of funding for public broadcasting.

There has been some concern expressed as to whether there is sufficient balance on public broadcasting. The subcommittee thought it would be useful to have this hearing to explore these issues before we make our final recommendations before the subcommittee meeting tomorrow and the full committee on Thursday. Then of course, there is floor action. So we think this would be helpful as a prelude what committee action on the appropriate level of funding should be. Congress likes to keep its hands off of these matters to avoid any politicization at all, but we do have the oversight responsibility and we have the appropriations function, so we are going to proceed with this hearing.

I would like to call the witnesses at this time: Ms. Patricia Harrison, President and CEO of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting; Mr. Ken Tomlinson, Chairman of the Board of Directors; Mr. Pat Mitchell, President and CEO of Public Broadcasting Service; Mr. John Lawson, President and CEO of the Association of

Public Television Stations; Mr. David Boaz, Executive Vice President of the Cato Institute.

Well, welcome, ladies and gentlemen. Thank you for coming in on a Monday hearing. Monday morning activities in the Congress are somewhat limited by tradition, but it is a very, very busy week with a great many items on our Congressional agenda.

Our first witness is Mr. Ken Tomlinson, Chairman of the CPB Board of Directors. First elected to the board in 1993, he began his career as a journalist with the Richmond Times-Dispatch in 1965; was a correspondent in Vietnam and was Director of the Voice of America for 2 years. Mr. Tomlinson was Editor in Chief of the Reader's Digest until he retired in 1996.

Our practice, ladies and gentlemen, as I think you have already been advised, is to have 5-minute opening statements, leaving the maximum amount of time for questions and answers following the opening statements.

Mr. Tomlinson, thank you for joining us and we look forward to your testimony.

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF KENNETH Y. TOMLINSON

Mr. TOMLINSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I did submit my testimony for the record so that we could preserve as much time as possible.

I am proud to be here in support of Federal funding for public broadcasting. I happen to believe that increasing the education basis of our children's programming alone merits a great deal of focus in terms of what we do in the coming weeks and months. As you well know, it is easier to show cartoons than to produce programming that has an education basis. We should be working so that our education-based programming helps young people learn how to read, but also helps people become interested in civic responsibility and, in the tradition of Tom Friedman, in math and science as well.

We have a rich history of cultural programs coming out of WNET in New York that I would like to see us be able to continue and expand. Obviously, across the river at WETA we have the great tradition of the "Jim Lehrer News Hour." This is journalism dating back to the original "McNeil-Lehrer Report," journalism that represents the highest standard. There has never been any question of balance on that program.

PREPARED STATEMENT

We look at the importance of the digital conversion. We look at the demands we face in terms of the need for a new interconnection system. I have brought the issue of the importance of political balance, common sense political balance, to the public debate. This should not overshadow the needs that public broadcasting has, and I am very pleased to be here to support those needs.

Thank you.

[The statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF KENNETH Y. TOMLINSON

I come to you this morning as an individual who supports Federal funding for public broadcasting.

I believe that education-based children's programming represents one of the most critical responsibilities for public broadcasters. We need to produce programming that will inspire children from all walks of life to want to read—to want to acquire knowledge about our nation's history and our own civic responsibilities. Taking a cue from Tom Friedman, we also should be inspiring interest in math and science, because surely we must recognize we live in a world that is flat.

The cultural programs—the great performances that in recent years have been produced by WNET in New York—are an important part of the mandate of public broadcasting. The current affairs programs coming from WETA—I speak specifically for the tradition of journalistic excellence that is the history of the NewsHour with Jim Lehrer—merit our support. So, too, is the excellent programming that has come to us over the years from WGBH in Boston.

The clock is ticking on the deadline for funding a new interconnection system for public broadcasting. The opportunities presented by a transition to digital broadcasting will open exciting new doors for the public broadcasting system.

In recent months I have asserted over and over again that you cannot understand the case for federal support of public broadcasting until you see the fruits of these services in states like North Carolina, Kentucky, and South Dakota. If you want to get an idea of the digital future of public broadcasting, go to North Carolina and see, thanks to public support for a bond issue, four channels that make public broadcasting far more relevant and far more valuable to the people of that state.

I would be remiss this morning, however, if I failed to address issues surrounding my work to meet the legal mandate that Congress placed on CPB to require political balance. Listen to Section 19 of the law that governs what we do: CPB shall facilitate the development of programs “of high quality, diversity, creativity, excellence, and innovation, which are obtained from diverse sources, will be made available to public telecommunications entities, with strict adherence to objectivity and balance in all programs or series of programs of a controversial nature . . .”

I did not initiate the controversy over balance, and I am the first to recognize this controversy has not been good for the health of public broadcasting. So allow me to review the actions that I have taken to encourage political balance for the sake of encouraging a wide base of support for what we do.

In late 2003, I went to the leadership of PBS to make the point that NOW with Bill Moyers had become a symbol of our ignoring our legal mandate to require balance. It was not that Bill Moyers work does not represent outstanding political advocacy broadcasting. I did not ask for a moment of the show to be removed from public broadcasting schedules. My point was that law requires a diversity of opinions, and on Friday evenings, public broadcasting would do well to reflect conservative points of view as it did so eloquently liberal points of view.

When PBS leadership asserted NOW to be balanced, I asked that a consultant review six months of the program and assess the political direction of the program's content. Later, I would ask the consultant to review other programs on public broadcasting to illustrate that unlike NOW they reflected diverse political opinions. The contract for this consultant was processed under the supervision of CPB staff and our General Counsel according to CPB rules and regulations. I had never known CPB board members to be involved in approving contracts with consultants—and I had observed any of a number of consultants brought in by CPB executive leadership to do similar tasks—so I did not run this issue by the board. At no time did I make any effort to keep the contract secret from my fellow board members.

Much has been made in recent days over the classifications of viewpoints expressed by Senator Chuck Hagel and former Congressman Robert Barr. As the researcher's work illustrates, Bill Moyers did not invite Senator Hagel on his show to give him a platform for advocating his belief that free trade is critical to the success of U.S. foreign policy. That would have run counter to Bill Moyers' deeply held beliefs that, by the way, were frequently given time on his program. No, Senator Hagel was asked to come to the Moyers show to talk about aspects of the war in Iraq that differed from the positions of President Bush.

Bob Barr was not invited on NOW to discuss his political philosophy that largely is in conflict with Mr. Moyers' position. Bob Barr was on the Moyers program to attack the Patriot Act, which not coincidentally, Bill Moyers questioned.

Again, there is an important audience for the liberal advocacy journalism that is Bill Moyers. The law, however, requires CPB to encourage balance when such programming is presented.

Fortunately the board leadership of PBS recognized that Friday evening programming should reflect diverse points of view. When it was clear that PBS was following through on this commitment, I ended the study and did not make it public because to do so would have called attention to the fact that for nearly two years

public broadcasting ignored our legal responsibility for presenting diverse viewpoints on controversial issues.

All of this occurred more than a year ago. So why did the issue become a staple in certain press venues in recent months? The answer to that question lies in the politics of public broadcasting—as well as the politics of year 2005. But one thing is certain. The more this debate continues, the more we jeopardize future public support for public broadcasting.

Clearly, it is time for us to lay aside partisanship, seek popular consensus for what public broadcasting should be doing, and go forward to meet the challenges that lie ahead.

I look forward to responding to any questions that the Senators might have.

Senator SPECTER. Thank you very much, Mr. Tomlinson.

We now turn to—you had concluded your verbal presentation?

Mr. TOMLINSON. Yes, sir.

Senator SPECTER. Thank you.

We turn now to Ms. Patricia Harrison, President and CEO of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. Prior to taking her current position, she served as Assistant Secretary of State for Education and Cultural Affairs. In 1997 she was elected Co-Chairman of the National Republican Committee, serving there until January of 2001, a graduate of American University.

Thank you for joining us, Ms. Harrison, and we look forward to your testimony.

STATEMENT OF PATRICIA HARRISON, PRESIDENT AND CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

Ms. HARRISON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I too have submitted my written testimony—

Senator SPECTER. All written testimony will be made a part of the record in full.

Ms. HARRISON. I would like, with your permission, to use my time just to make a few brief remarks.

Senator SPECTER. That is fine.

Ms. HARRISON. Thank you. First let me express my strong commitment to and belief in the mission of public broadcasting. Although I have been in the position of President and CEO of CPB for only 5 working days, it is a belief I have long held. It began when I served as an intern at WAMU as a student at American University. It continued when my children were small and we all watched “Sesame Street” together, and then much later “Masterpiece Theater.” It grew as I listened to NPR in the morning before I began my day as Assistant Secretary at the State Department.

I believe that public broadcasting is in the public interest, that it furthers the general welfare of all our citizens, that it is a vital connection to community for millions of Americans, all races, all ages, urban and rural, and for new Americans and their children. Public broadcasting strengthens our civil society and it merits the investment of monies represented by our budget request for 2006 and 2008.

My second point: I am committed to protecting the nonpartisan nature of public broadcasting. As you said, I come to CPB after almost 4 years as Assistant Secretary of State, managing a bureau of hundreds of people, civil servants, Foreign Service officers, working with 1,500 public and private organizations and 80,000 volunteers to facilitate 30,000 nonpartisan educational, cultural, and professional exchanges annually.

I am ready to work with Congress, the CPB Board, staff, the public broadcasting stations, national organizations, public and private funders in an open and transparent way in order to serve the millions of Americans who turn to public broadcasting each week.

Now let me turn to the budget. CPB is requesting \$430 million in advance appropriations for fiscal year 2008, the vast majority of which will go directly to local television and radio stations for locally based, locally relevant operations. The corporation requests \$45 million in fiscal year 2006 for the ongoing conversion to digital technology. We are requesting \$40 million in 2006 to fund the replacement of the public television interconnection system.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize that we make these requests at a time of great pressure on the Federal budget. But when we appeal to Congress for funds, we should recognize that hundreds of thousands of Americans are already including public broadcasting support in their personal budgets by writing checks to support these programs, and the fact is that every dollar of Federal funding is matched six times over by voluntary contributions from viewers, foundations, universities, State and local governments, corporations, and small business owners, and of every dollar of Federal funding we receive 95 cents of that dollar goes to the local stations and services they provide. Public broadcasting really represents the best example of public-private partnerships.

We have all read the research on the importance of early learning and, though "Sesame Street" showed us the way 37 years ago, the need is even greater today. Public television is responding to that need and in fact it is public television's responsibility. Whether we are talking about ages 2 through 8 and early learning programs or middle school to high school with a focus on history and civics, the aim is to ensure our country's successor generation is prepared for the future.

For those who have questioned the relevance of public broadcasting in a multi-channel world, the answer is that public broadcasting is more relevant than ever. We address community needs, we provide entertainment, education, information programming, and none of this is matched anywhere else in the 500-channel universe. That is just one of the reasons more than 100 million Americans tune in every week for uninterrupted programs where they are treated as citizens, not just as consumers.

PREPARED STATEMENT

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, on behalf of my new colleagues in public broadcasting let me say how much we appreciate the vital support Congress continues to provide. I look forward to working with the committee on behalf of public broadcasting in the public interest.

Thank you and I will be happy to address any questions you may have.

[The statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF PATRICIA S. HARRISON

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, thank you for this opportunity to discuss with you the Corporation for Public Broadcasting's funding requests for fiscal year 2006 and fiscal year 2008. Although I became CPB's President only 1

week ago, I have long understood and appreciated the vital role that public broadcasting plays in the lives of so many Americans.

I accepted the challenge of leading CPB because I believe that public broadcasting serves as a vital connector to community for so many Americans rural and urban. Public broadcasters offer television and radio worth watching and listening to, and that is why so many of us spend our most precious resource—our time—on public broadcasting. I believe public broadcasting is a unique source of education, information, and entertainment that fully deserves strong, continuing congressional support.

There is another reason I wanted to lead CPB. It is based on my almost 4 years serving as Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs. In that capacity, I managed a bureau of hundreds of people, worked with 1,500 public/private partnerships and 80,000 volunteers to conduct 30,000 cultural, professional and educational exchange programs annually, including the prestigious Fulbright and International Visitor programs.

These vital programs were also connectors between the American people and citizens from other countries. In the early 1990's, the budget was cut for exchanges and just when we needed to have this critical outreach after September 11, 2001, the resources were not there. I am very proud that I was able to increase our budget with the help of Congress. My goal was to reach out beyond the elites to younger, more diverse audiences, and to affirm and connect with what we have in common as opposed to our differences. One example—with the strong support of Senators Kennedy and Lugar, we were able to create the first high school program for boys and girls from the Arab Muslim world.

I see a similar challenge facing public broadcasting today. This is an important time to affirm what we have and to work to make it better, to reinvigorate public broadcasting and underscore its unique relevance in the multi-channel world.

I have a proven track record of leadership, and I am ready, willing and eager to help lead this organization into a strengthened relationship with public broadcasting stations, national organizations, public and private funders, and the millions of Americans who turn to public broadcasting each week.

As I begin my tenure at CPB, I am particularly fortunate to be able to build on what the corporation's staff and their colleagues throughout the public broadcasting community have already done. Mr. Chairman, today I will mention just a few of these initiatives—work that is possible, Mr. Chairman, because of the commitment made by Congress and so many others in the public interest, and work that I believe will help us leverage an even greater return on the public's investment.

As the distinguished committee knows, public broadcasting is a collection of locally based stations that serve both local and national needs.

Public broadcasters offer coverage of national news—and of local high school and college sports. They bring the world's greatest artists and performances into our living rooms, and they collaborate with local arts and cultural institutions. Public broadcasting reaches children just learning to read, and often these children are sitting in front of the television with parents who are themselves learning to read in a new language.

Public broadcasting is not one size fits all. What you see and hear depends upon where you live and what the communities needs are.

—in Pennsylvania, you can explore your state's history with *Marking Pennsylvania History on WHYY*;

—in Iowa, you can tune in to *Living in Iowa*, a monthly statewide magazine show;

—and in North Dakota, you can keep up on all the doings with *Dakota Datebook*, daily on North Dakota Public Radio.

All across the country, stations are bringing different services and programming, informed by community attitudes and concerns, to their audiences. They are able to do this so effectively because they are locally owned and operated. They know their communities, what their neighbors want in terms of programming, what their local organizations need in terms of support. In a word, they are connected. And that connection is one that distant commercial media simply can't or won't provide.

Mr. Chairman, with your permission, I'd like to turn now to our funding requests and the ways in which those federal dollars benefit citizens and communities across the country.

These requests were of course submitted before I came aboard last week, but I have had the opportunity to review them with staff and believe they merit strong support.

CPB is requesting \$430 million in advance appropriations for fiscal year 2008, the vast majority of which will flow directly to local public television and radio stations for locally based, locally relevant operations.

Additionally, the corporation requests \$45 million in fiscal year 2006 for the ongoing conversion to digital technology. Mr. Chairman, this is so important. As the result of the investment made by Congress so far, hundreds of public television and radio stations are offering digital signals, and we have recently begun making grants to develop new digital services for local communities.

Digital is the future of broadcasting and the future is here. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, public broadcasting must be enabled to participate fully in that future, and thanks to your ongoing support, it is well on the way.

Finally, CPB is requesting \$40 million in fiscal year 2006 to fund replacement of the public television interconnection system. Given the scheduled expiration of public television's satellite leases, we must not miss this opportunity to develop a system that is both more efficient and compatible with the new digital technologies.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize that we make these requests in a time of great pressure on the federal budget. The requested funds, however, represent an investment of only about \$1.75 per American—and the return on investment is far greater in terms of value to older citizens, urban and rural residents, and minority audiences. If this were a stock, I would argue it is one of the best investments the American people have ever made.

Public broadcasting serves every one. There are no qualifications of age and income; no requirements for matching funds; no copays. Instead, public broadcasting is available to virtually every American, free of charge, in every community across the country. And every week, more than 100 million of our fellow citizens take advantage of the opportunity to tune in.

In fact, this July 4th I began my day in Washington, D.C. listening to *Morning Edition* and the reading of the Declaration of Independence. My day ended at the Capitol Fourth concert and fireworks on the Capitol steps. Public television covered this event, which meant that my 90-year-old mother and so many others like her throughout the country could share in the celebration of America's birthday without leaving home.

Of every dollar CPB receives from the federal government, 95 cents goes to local stations, either directly, or indirectly to support radio, television and on-line programming, research and technology.

The largest amount by far—72 cents of every dollar—goes directly to local public television and public radio stations. As I said, these stations are uniquely connected to their communities. They determine their own program schedules, and often produce their own programming; they respond to community needs and leverage local support.

CPB also supports the creation of programming for radio, television, and new media. Probably every American is familiar with signature programs like *Masterpiece Theater* and *Sesame Street*, but today, we're funding tomorrow's classics. If you've heard any of the new *StoryCorps* or *This I Believe* segments on public radio or listened to Philadelphia's own Terry Gross, you know what I mean. And we have similarly high hopes for our newly announced children's programming initiative, which will continue public broadcasting's leadership in high-quality, non-commercial, educational programming for children; for America at a Crossroads, which will explore the issues facing us in the wake of the 9/11 attacks; and for the American History and Civics Initiative, which will capitalize on today's technology to reach and teach middle and high school students.

To carry out its mandate to serve the underserved, CPB provides support to five minority consortia—representing the unique points of views of Latinos, African-Americans, Native Americans, Asian Americans, and Pacific Islanders. We also fund the Independent Television Service, through which the work of innovative, independent filmmakers is made available to the public television audience.

And we also work to ensure that the programs we support have a life long after the television and radio are turned off. Materials are available on website and for classroom use and often prove enduringly popular as the years go on. Radio material, too, is available for download or web-based listening. And programming is frequently supported with direct, person-to-person outreach, something distinguishes public broadcasting from our commercial counterparts. In other words, our impact resonates well beyond the broadcast.

Another six cents of every dollar go to projects that benefit the entire public broadcasting community. We negotiate and pay music royalties for all of public broadcasting, for example, allowing audiences nationwide to enjoy new and classic recordings, and we recently completed the most comprehensive audience research project in public television history, information that producers and broadcasters will use to guide programming decisions for years to come.

With special appropriations from Congress, CPB helps local public broadcasters provide the advanced public service digital technology makes possible. We are fund-

ing the upgrade of the public television interconnection system that delivers programming to stations. And we are funding station purchases of digital equipment that they will use to provide new and needed streams of news, music, and public service programming. From homeland security information to special streams of programming for kids, the public investment is creating a deeper, richer mix of services available to people across the country.

CPB's administrative expenses are limited by law to five percent, but we normally hold them even lower. Less than a nickel of every federal dollar stays in Washington; the rest is spent to benefit stations across the country.

The Federal appropriation accounts for only about 15 percent of the entire cost of public broadcasting, and stations and other organizations must work very hard to raise the money to fund their activities. In fact, CPB funded the Major Giving Initiative, which has helped stations sharpen their community-based fundraising skills and improve their balance sheets.

The Federal dollars are critically to leveraging all the other resources. It opens the door for funding from state and local governments, universities, businesses, foundations, by providing a "seal of approval" from the Federal Government.

The funding we receive from Congress ensures that public broadcasting continues to offer programming and services that are superior across the board to those offered by commercial competitors. As Ken Burns has said, "The programming on PBS, in all of its splendid variety, offers the rarest treat amidst the outrageous cacophony of our television marketplace—it gives us back our attention and our memory. And by so doing insures that we have a future."

Public broadcasting attracts the support of viewers and listeners nationwide—people from all walks of life, who add their dollars to the vital core of Federal support, writing the checks to fund programs and services that are important to their lives, leisure, and careers.

The Public Broadcasting Act describes public television and radio stations as "valuable community resources" that can help address local concerns. The American public has already invested a great deal in creating, preserving and now modernizing these resources. With the requested funding, we will work to fulfill their hopes and expectations by continuing to deliver high quality, high value services.

Mr. Chairman, members of the subcommittee, on behalf of all my colleagues in public broadcasting, let me say how much we appreciate the vital support Congress continues to provide. And let me say personally that I understand how valuable public broadcasting is. Plain and simple, strong public broadcasting means a stronger democracy. I take that responsibility extremely seriously. Thank you, and I will be happy to try to answer any questions you may have.

Senator SPECTER. Thank you very much, Ms. Harrison.

We have been joined by the distinguished Senator from Hawaii, Senator Inouye, who has been in the Congress as long as Hawaii has been a State, initially in the House of Representatives and in the Senate, 1960?

Senator INOUE. 1963.

Senator SPECTER. 1963.

Would you care to make an opening statement, Senator?

Senator INOUE. I thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. But at this moment I would prefer just to ask questions.

Senator SPECTER. Thank you. Thank you very much.

Our third witness is Ms. Pat Mitchell, President and CEO of Public Broadcasting Service. She has a broad and distinguished background as a journalist, television executive, and educator. During her 3-decade career, she has been recognized at her work at NBC, CBS, ABC, and CNN; a graduate of the University of Georgia.

Thank you for joining us, Ms. Mitchell. We look forward to your testimony.

STATEMENT OF HON. PAT MITCHELL, PRESIDENT AND CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, PUBLIC BROADCASTING SERVICE

Ms. MITCHELL. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and I welcome Senator Inouye on behalf of the PBS Board Chair Mary Bidderman, who hails from Hawaii, as you know.

I am very grateful for this opportunity to be here to support the appropriations request for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. Mr. Chairman, allow me to welcome Pat Harrison to the community of public broadcasting. Last week Pat and I shared the PBC Fourth of July Concert and we celebrated both our country's independence and also the value of a Public Broadcasting Service who can independently bring such a celebration through our local station, WETA, and its leader, Sharon Rockefeller, who is with us as well, into every American home.

We understand the enormous responsibilities we all have in leading such a valued media enterprise at such a time of transformational change, a time when our mission, which is to use the power of media to serve the public good, is more needed than ever. And we are grateful, Mr. Chairman, that in such a time when you have such challenging choices to appropriate public funds that you continue to appropriate them for public media.

Public media must have the public's trust. It is our rating system, our currency, our measure of achievement. In a recent Roper poll, Americans named public broadcasting the most trusted national institution in this country. The result of this trust is the collective good work of public broadcasting producers, stations, and the collective goodwill of the American people we serve. It is also, Mr. Chairman, the result of a collaborative, constructive relationship between the management of the public broadcasting organizations seated at this table.

It is a great affirmation to know that Americans indicate in independent surveys they consider public television to be their best value for their tax dollars, second only to military defense.

So what is PBS's role, then, in using these funds? We are not a network like ABC or CBS, but we do provide nearly 3,000 hours of top-quality educationally-based programs to 170 public television stations, who distribute them to 350 communities. These are the programs that define public television, but they come through essentially local institutions, built on local values, serving public and local community interests.

During my tenure at PBS, I have visited more than 100 of these stations and on these visits I have seen the positive results of public service media in our communities up close and personal. I wish I had the time to share the smiles and appreciative thank-yous that have come from parents and caregivers and teachers and home schoolers in every community. I meet these people and for them PBS is not a luxury or a burden; it is an important part of their lives.

Let us not forget the 40 million Americans without cable or satellite. It also matters that, even in homes where there are 300 channel choices, PBS is still among the top six media choices, viewed by more than 70 percent of Americans every month. Add to that the millions of visitors to pbs.org and station websites every day, learners of all ages, taking advantage of 175,000 pages of edu-

cational content. Then add the millions more that are reached through educational services and community partnerships, and you begin, Mr. Chairman, to get a picture of the true scale, the unparalleled power of reach and power that PBS and our stations in our community are bringing to communities in this country.

We do it in ways that have earned the public's trust: children's programs that educate, science programs that illuminate, history that is definitive, memorable, news and documentaries that are trustworthy and reliable, because of the editorial standards that ensure accuracy, fairness, and balance across our schedule, all of our programs produced in the public interest, not to motivate consumers.

PBS's management, Mr. Chairman, not the PBS board or any other party, is ultimately responsible for ensuring these standards guide our decision-making and public opinion polls verify that the public perceives we are doing it, free of bias and any undue influence from any source.

Then beyond being a broadcaster that is so valued, we are also this Nation's largest educational service, the leading source of on-line lesson plans, 3,500 free on-line, the number one choice of educational content in classrooms. More than 5 million adults receive their GEDs through public television stations; workplace essential training; and over the past 10 years a partnership with the Department of Education has changed the lives of hundreds of millions of parents and caregivers through Ready To Learn and Ready To Teach. We have prepared children for school achievement and we have prepared teachers to use the latest technology to meet today and tomorrow's learners.

PREPARED STATEMENT

With your support, we will continue to build on this foundation of trust and use all the new technologies to deliver even more public service.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I look forward to your questions.

[The statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF PAT MITCHELL

Mr. Chairman, members of the Subcommittee: I welcome this opportunity to be a witness on behalf of the Public Broadcasting Service, this country's largest public service media enterprise, which is also this country's most trusted national institution, according to a recent Roper Poll.

Public media must have the public's trust. Trust is our ratings system. Our currency. Our measure of achievement.

And like public education, public health programs, and public libraries, public broadcasting is supported by public funds—another reason why it is essential to be sure that we have earned the public's trust.

I am pleased to share that Americans have said in independent surveys that public television is the best value for their tax dollars, second only to military defense. This may surprise some, just as many are surprised to learn that the amount of those tax dollars is about one tax dollar per citizen per year, totaling less than 20 percent of the costs of operating public radio and television stations in communities across the country.

This investment of public funds is the foundation upon which public broadcasting has built a national/local, public/private partnership that is unique in the world, and it is crucial that we maintain that foundation. Therefore, we are asking this committee to fund \$430 million to the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for fiscal year 2008 to support local stations' operations and public broadcasting programming.

Only in America with our strong philanthropic culture would a media enterprise such as PBS meet its mission year after year by leveraging every tax dollar with three or four private dollars from foundations, corporations, and yes, viewers like you, voluntarily adding their personal dollars to ensure that the programs and services of public broadcasting continue in their communities.

Those viewers come from every sector of our communities, closely aligned in age, ethnicity, education and income with the overall demographic picture of this country. It is a committed constituency who believes—as Congress has historically indicated through its appropriations votes—that in a media landscape of hundreds of media businesses with fewer and fewer owners, with more choices than ever but fewer real options, that this country needs, perhaps more than ever, one media enterprise that resists the race to the bottom for profits and popularity, that respects the intelligence of its audience and responds to the need for programs that reflect our values and both celebrate and document the best of our history and culture.

We need one media enterprise, as originally conceived over 35 years ago, that is not using its power to sell, cannot be bought or influenced and that truly does belong to all of the American people. It is those people's voices that have been heard in these halls and around the country to protect a service that is open to voices from every perspective, that tackles the tough, complex issues they want and need to understand, that puts them on the frontlines of the news and in the front rows of the theatre and that teaches their children letters and numbers as well as respect and other pro-social behavior.

Those are the “viewers like you” who never ask the question, “Who needs PBS in today's media landscape?” And yes, among them, are the often forgotten 40 million Americans who cannot afford or do not choose the options of cable or satellite. For them and for most rural communities, the funds to support a new interconnection system are critical to the sustainability of the national public broadcasting service that connects all 348 member stations to PBS and to each other.

Because of their unique national/local structure, PBS and its member stations also offer a unique and important means of communicating during a crisis. Trials are under way to determine how best to serve first responders and how to ensure communities get what they need in times of disaster. The interconnection system must be updated to fully optimize this additional service for Americans.

Therefore, we are asking that this committee fund the \$40 million needed to build out the interconnection system so that we can ensure the universal reach that is our mandate and the delivery of national and local programs that serve our mission.

“Serve” is the operative word because PBS and its 348 member stations have a mission to serve, not to sell, to inform and engage citizens, not to motivate them as consumers.

This is a distinction with a big difference and the difference can be measured by results. I'd like to share a few of them with you today.

The most obvious and most celebrated are the programs, consistently among the most honored for educational value, excellence in quality and journalistic standards, and—even in the midst of 300 media choices—still among the top choices every week in most households and still viewed by nearly 70 percent of American households. In addition, PBS was chosen again this year as the number one television and video resource for classrooms by teachers across the country.

Those who question whether there is still a need for PBS when there are so many other choices need to take a closer look at those other choices. I think you would agree that “Monster Garage” is not really a substitute for “Masterpiece Theatre.” And while distracting and amusing, “Dancing with the Stars” will not have the long lasting value of PBS' series on Broadway, a Ken Burn's history of jazz or baseball or the upcoming World War II program.

At PBS, we do not begin with questions like, Will this program sell a product? We begin with questions like, What's the educational value of the content? How can teachers use it? Will it have lasting value to learners of all ages? Is it comprehensive, well researched? Does it contribute to a diversity of perspectives on the subject? Does it add to the understanding of our community, our country and our world? Will it open a mind, change a life, strengthen a family, teach a skill, connect a community? Will it comply with PBS's editorial standards for reliability, transparency, objectivity and balance?

PBS recently updated its editorial standards with the help of a blue ribbon panel of journalism experts and also created the position of PBS ombudsman to ensure both transparency and responsiveness to the public. A search is under way to fill that new role.

Every year, PBS distributes almost 3000 hours of programs that meet our high standards:

- Children’s programs that teach the concepts of literacy and math, which foster respect and pro-social behavior, which get our youngest and most disadvantaged ready to learn and prepared for school.
- Science and history programs that set the standard for accuracy and comprehensiveness and are, along with the rest of our programming, the most used TV and video curricula in American schools.
- Drama and performance programs that celebrate our country’s great cultural diversity and inspire the artists, the dancers, the writers and musicians of tomorrow.
- News and investigative journalism programs that Americans turn to for an understanding of the complex issues of our times.

And this is just the tip of the iceberg.

Many of these programs and additional educational content go to PBS.org, which learners of all ages visit more than one million times a day to view 175,000 pages of content—web sites that extend the value of PBS and that link users seamlessly to their local PBS station web sites for local information, programs and educational services. Teachers across the country use nearly 4,000 highly credible, freely available lesson plans and study guides based on PBS content in their classrooms, all customized to national and state curriculum standards.

Beyond broadcast and the Internet are the extensive and diverse outreach activities that engage PBS and stations in additional community service for which our content is perfectly suited: Through a Department of Education grant, Ready To Teach, our PBS TeacherLine service has been training teachers in reading, math, science, curriculum & instruction and technology integration. Everywhere I go around this country, teachers express appreciation for this professional development training, which is available through online courses, videoconferencing and face-to-face workshops, and for the state-of-the art digital technology PBS and its member stations are deploying to America’s classrooms and school systems. The committee’s support of these programs is essential, and we are requesting that this committee fund \$17 million to enable PBS and its member stations to continue providing this critical service.

In addition to providing teachers with access to training, PBS and its stations are meeting another community need, offering training to workers who have faced layoffs or hold jobs in industries in transition. KET, a statewide network of PBS member stations in Kentucky, is addressing the need to keep Americans fully engaged in the economic lives of their communities by offering through PBS distribution and to other stations a program that teaches workplace skills.

Together with stations and partnerships with institutions of learning, PBS also offers video curriculum and materials for Americans seeking to complete their high school education and take college classes. More than 2 million Americans have received their GED certificates through PBS programs, and PBS and its local stations have helped more than 6 million adults earn college credit using PBS courses.

When he signed the law creating public broadcasting in 1967, President Johnson said we should “use the miracles of communication to create the miracles of learning.” PBS and its member stations are doing this every day in every community, making us the single largest educational institution in the country.

Education is a significant part of what we do, and the return on investment of tax dollars can be measured in the number of children better prepared to read and to succeed in school and in the number of Americans in every community who are being informed and educated through public service media.

Traveling the country as the president and CEO of PBS, I have seen these results up close and personal.

In rural Pennsylvania, I spoke with a young woman who thanked me for her high school diploma and the college degree she expects to earn through her PBS station.

I have met teachers in Iowa who use our videos and DVDs who look to us to train all teachers in the best uses of technology.

I have visited kindergartens and have seen caregivers in Mississippi, some with few educational resources, put in a DVD of our PBS KIDS program “Between the Lions” and I have watched the joy on children’s faces when they used that program to connect the letters to a word they’re learning.

I have been in homes in Texas where there were no books until our Ready To Learn program provided books for the children learning to read and taught the parents how to support literacy in the home.

And I have talked with hundreds of homeschoolers for whom PBS content comprise their core curriculum.

Education is our mission and we need your support to ensure that we can sustain this service, particularly through Ready To Learn, for which we are asking this committee to fund \$32 million for programs and community outreach. Developed in co-

operation with the Department of Education, Ready To Learn has helped nearly one million parents and teachers prepare eight million children for success in school using local public television stations as outreach partners.

We are working to strengthen our educational offerings in the future through an effort called the Digital Future Initiative (DFI), led by former Netscape Chairman Jim Barksdale and former FCC Chair Reed Hundt. The panel, made up of experts from inside and outside public broadcasting, is examining the future of learning and technology, and analyzing where PBS and its member stations fit into that future.

The DFI will recommend new services we can deploy in the digital future for learners of all ages, but nothing will be possible without current funding, which we hope you will support. With that, we will solicit new partners who share our education mission, once again leveraging the private funds to make the public funds go even further.

With your help in securing the foundation of public funds—the all-important investment of public dollars—PBS and its member stations are the best positioned media enterprise to succeed in the digital future—in fact, to lead it. Eighty-nine percent of our stations have converted at least their transmission facilities, but some remain in need and cannot be left behind. We are asking this committee for \$45 million to help stations fund the conversion to digital broadcast technology.

For PBS and for those stations that have converted, the transition to digital means a transition to a new way of serving the American people by deploying our already considerable offerings across platforms that respond to our audience's needs in this media landscape. And that is what this is all about. Harnessing the current power of media—unprecedented in its capability to do good—on behalf of the American people.

In a media landscape transformed by technology, consolidating in ownership and power, this country needs one media enterprise:

- where education comes first;
- where partisanship is checked at the newsroom door;
- where editorial guidelines ensure that all content produced for us is fair, transparent in the process and accurate. We have recently updated our editorial guidelines to ensure that we continue to achieve these goals at every level.

In a media landscape where fewer and fewer Americans trust the press, we maintain our high level of trust because the public believes that we are independent of pressures that come from the marketplace and the influence of any funding source.

And in a media environment where our children are spending 4 to 6 hours a day interacting and engaged with media of some sort, we offer a media experience that is committed to the values of family and the values of this democracy.

We are this country's only media enterprise that invests public funds in a public-private partnership through a strong national program service and an interconnected community of locally owned media institutions, public radio and public television stations. And we are this country's only media enterprise that delivers programs and services that meet community needs and that measures our value and relevancy by how many minds we open, how many lives we change, how many ways we strengthen communities and how well we serve this democracy.

Senator SPECTER. Thank you. Thank you very much, Ms. Mitchell.

Our next witness is Mr. John Lawson, President and CEO of the Association of Public Television Stations. He served on the board of the National Coalition for Technology in Education and Training, was appointed to the Federal Communications Commission's Media Security and Reliability Council in 2002, a graduate of the University of South Carolina.

Thank you for coming in this morning, Mr. Lawson, and the floor is yours.

STATEMENT OF JOHN M. LAWSON, PRESIDENT AND CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, ASSOCIATION OF PUBLIC TELEVISION STATIONS

Mr. LAWSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Senator Inouye. Thanks for inviting me to testify on behalf of America's 356 local public television stations. In an era of media consolidation, our stations are among the last of the locally controlled media and that fact alone makes them vital to our democratic society.

With all that has been said and written about public broadcasting, especially over the past few weeks, my concern is that we not lose sight of who we really are and, more to the point, who we really serve. It is not the media, it is not the pundits, and it is not us here in this room. It is viewers and listeners who turn to public TV and radio as their most trusted source for news and public affairs. It is children, whose public education is improved by programs in reading, math, and science. It is parents, who depend on public television for home schooling and for family-friendly and non-violent programming. And it is people living in Russell, Kansas, and Cumming, Iowa, Hooper Bay, Alaska, and other rural communities who depend on public TV and radio as information lifelines.

Senator SPECTER. Why special concern about Russell, Kansas?

Mr. LAWSON. I understand that is where you were born, sir.

Senator SPECTER. Close. Bob Dole was born there. I was born in Wichita, moved there when I was 12.

Mr. LAWSON. Okay, where you grew up.

Senator SPECTER. Glad to have Russell included. You can have some extra time for mentioning that.

Mr. LAWSON. I will take it.

So these are the real people, Senator, that public broadcasting serves. But make no mistake, our viewers challenge us and we challenge ourselves to keep pace with a changing society. With the support of this subcommittee, we are converting to digital, DTV. In practical terms, that means that, instead of broadcasting a single program, stations can reach nontraditional learners, kids, the elderly, Spanish speakers, and rural Americans with multiple news services simultaneously.

I am also pleased to report that the Department of Homeland Security has turned to our stations as the backbone for upgrading the Cold War-era emergency alert system and overcoming the communications bottlenecks we saw on 9–11 both here and in New York City.

Mr. Chairman, just over 2 weeks ago the House of Representatives voted by a two to one margin to restore \$100 million that the House Appropriations Subcommittee cut from CPB. While we are grateful for that bipartisan vote of confidence, funding for four critically important programs still was completely eliminated in the House bill. Tomorrow this subcommittee will take on the different task of allocating scarce resources.

So please let me summarize what our stations believe is needed to continue serving their communities. First and foremost, CPB funding is irreplaceable for our stations. It is the foundation. It is the seed money on which all the other money we raise stands.

Also very important is the longstanding practice of this subcommittee to provide these funds 2 years in advance. This allows for good planning, provides a buffer from politics, and does not cost the Federal Government any more than a current year appropriation.

For CPB, we urge you to appropriate \$430 million for fiscal year 2008, an increase of \$30 million over what was appropriated last year and the year before. These additional funds are needed, among other reasons, because stations are required to transmit

both analog and digital signals and added cost for electricity alone is \$30 million per year.

NEXT GENERATION INTERCONNECTION SYSTEM

Two years ago, this subcommittee recognized that our current satellite system is wearing out. We have planned a 4-year phase-in of a new system that will allow local stations, wherever they are, to share programming with one another across their State and across the country. For this year's installment we are requesting level funding, \$40 million.

CPB DIGITAL TRANSITION FUNDS

This is another temporary line item. Next year the FCC requires stations to deliver full power digital signals and have their final DTV channel allocations in place. To help stations meet these Federal mandates and complete their digital buildup, we are requesting \$45 million. This augments State and private funding.

READY TO LEARN, READY TO TEACH

If I can characterize CPB funds as the foundation for our stations, I would describe these programs as the crown jewels. Ready to Learn provides educational programming for tens of millions of American children and its outreach component has helped to further prepare eight million children to enter school. Ready to Teach uses technology to help train teachers in core subjects and provides grants to stations to create world-class curriculum content. We are requesting \$32 million for Ready to Learn and \$17 million for Ready to Teach.

PREPARED STATEMENT

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, Senator Inouye, you and ranking member Harkin and Chairman Cochran and Stevens and your colleagues on this subcommittee have provided steadfast support for public broadcasting. Through good times and bad, you have made it possible for public stations to serve uniquely their local communities. We are deeply grateful for your lifetime support.

Thank you.

[The statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF JOHN M. LAWSON

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee: Thank you for the opportunity to testify on behalf of our members—representing the 356 local public television stations across the nation. In an era of mergers and acquisitions, our stations are among the last of the locally-controlled media and, in that regard, perhaps best reflect one of the central tenets of our democratic society.

With all that's been said and written about public broadcasting, especially over the past several weeks, my concern is that we not become distracted from our core issues. More to the point, I think it's important that we not lose sight of who we serve.

It's not the media. It's not the pundits. And it's not really us in Washington.

—It's the viewers and listeners who turn to public TV and radio as their most trusted source for news and public affairs.

—It's the children whose public education is improved by programs in reading, math and science.

—It's the parents who depend on public television for home-schooling, and who want to be assured that what their children watch on TV is family-friendly and non-violent.

—And it's the people living in Russell, Kansas, Cumming, Iowa, Tunica, Mississippi, Hoppers Bay, Alaska and other rural communities, who depend on public TV and radio as a lifeline for news and weather alerts. These are the real people public broadcasting serves.

THE DIGITAL AGE

But make no mistake. We are not resting on our laurels. Our viewers challenge us—and we challenge ourselves—to keep pace with a changing society.

With the support of this subcommittee, we are converting to digital television broadcasting [DTV]. In practical terms, this means that instead of transmitting a single program over the airwaves, stations can now broadcast a wide range of new services, including standards-based education, all-day channels for kids, and expanded public affairs and local programming, simultaneously. DTV means we can reach non traditional learners, the elderly, Spanish language speakers and Rural Americans as never before.

I'm also pleased to report that the Department of Homeland Security has turned to our stations for help with upgrading the aging Emergency Alert System [EAS]—using our digital signals to overcome the communications bottlenecks we saw on 9/11, both here and in New York City.

Last year, in fact, my association and DHS signed a cooperative agreement to begin a pilot project in the National Capital Region to demonstrate the capabilities of public television's infrastructure to support the distribution of digital EAS messages. The goal was to prove that we could distribute digital EAS messages (such as audio, video, and/or data messages) wirelessly to any number of communications devices: TVs, radios, PCs, cell phones, pagers and wireless networks.

The pilot has been a success, and I am gratified to make an important announcement today. Building upon the success of this pilot project here in the National Capital Region, DHS has signed a new cooperative agreement with APTS to plan the national roll-out of the Digital Emergency Alert System. We will use the PBS satellite system and the local public television stations as the backbone for this significantly upgraded public warning system.

HOUSE ACTION

Just over two weeks ago, the House of Representatives voted—by a 2 to 1 margin—to restore \$100 million cut from the Corporation for Public Broadcasting by the House Appropriations Committee. While we are grateful for that bipartisan vote of confidence, unfortunately, the House bill still fails to fund four critically important programs: next generation interconnection, digital conversion, ready to learn and ready to teach. In other words, the bill sent by the House to the Senate falls more than \$103 million short of what is required to sustain public broadcasting's mission in the 21st century.

Moreover, we believe the House cuts presented a great fiscal contradiction. On the one hand, two authorizing committees—Budget and Commerce—have made the digital conversion of the television industry a major priority. This is because the Federal Government can recover and auction off the nation's analog television spectrum for billions of dollars in new revenue, without raising taxes. Some of these channels have already been promised to public safety. On the other hand, this will occur only when consumers all make the switch and broadcasters cease analog transmission.

Public television has clearly led the broadcasting industry in driving the digital conversion. Yet the House cuts would severely damage our digital transition at precisely the moment in history when Public Television is doing the most to make the auctions feasible by a date certain. In purely financial terms, cuts to public television are penny-wise and pound foolish.

Tomorrow, this subcommittee will take on the difficult task of allocating scarce resources across a range of important programs. So, if I may, I'd like to briefly review what our local stations believe is needed to continue serving their communities.

CPB ADVANCE FUNDING

First and foremost, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting is the lifeblood of funding for our stations. Federal funding is the foundation, the seed money on which we raise all other money.

As you know, there has been a long-standing practice of providing CPB funds two years in advance, so that stations can more effectively plan and manage their operations, as well as leverage non-Federal funds. Doing so does not cost the Federal Government any more than a current-year appropriation would.

For CPB, we ask that no funds previously appropriated for fiscal year 2006 be rescinded. We suggest that the outpouring of popular support for public broadcasting that compelled the full House to restore a \$100 million cut by the House Appropriations Committee is the clearest expression of opposition to any rescission.

We further urge you to appropriate \$430 million for fiscal year 2008, an increase of \$30 million over what was appropriated last year. This represents an annualized increase over two years of three and three-quarters percent. These additional funds are needed because stations are required to transmit both analog and digital signals. Just the added cost for electricity amounts to \$30 million—annually.

NEXT GENERATION INTERCONNECTION SYSTEM

Two years ago, this subcommittee recognized that our current satellite interconnection system is wearing out and badly in need of replacement. We set out a four-year phase-in of a new system that will allow local stations—wherever they are—to share programming with one another, across their state, and across the country.

For this year's installment, we are requesting level funding—\$40 million.

We call this system the Next Generation Interconnection System, or NGIS. Like its predecessors, NGIS will serve as a distribution system linking PBS to local stations. Yet this time, stations will be equipped with servers that will store programming, digitally, to be aired—or shared—at the station's discretion.

In engineering-speak, NGIS will give public broadcasters station-to-station connectivity, on demand. Let me give you an example of what that capability means in the real world.

Let's assume that WHYY in Philadelphia has produced a program on the history and preservation of the Liberty Bell. In the NGIS world, WHYY will be able to distribute the program to any station in the country that wants it with the ease of a few clicks of a mouse. But that's just the beginning. Perhaps a station in say, Bethel, Alaska, is working with their local school district to put together some multimedia history content. A station employee in Alaska gets online to search public television archives and, lo and behold, not only finds what WHYY has produced on the Liberty Bell, but can choose just a small segment of that program—whatever works best for them. Think of this station-to-station sharing feature as connecting hundreds of local digital libraries that house local content.

CPB DIGITAL

Next year, the Federal Government requires that public television stations deliver a full digital signal to their entire viewing area, and that the final digital channel selection for stations be in place. To help meet these Federal mandates, we are requesting \$45 million to help stations complete their digital build-out. This augments the DTV conversion funds that have come from State governments and private fundraising. With funding for fiscal year 2006, our request will ramp down to zero over the next few years. Without this funding, rural and smaller public television stations are at real risk of going dark when the digital clock strikes 12:00.

READY TO LEARN/READY TO TEACH

If I can characterize CPB as the lifeblood of our stations, I would describe the Ready To Learn and Ready To Teach programs as the crown jewel in public broadcasting. These programs are what the term "educational" in our governing statute are all about.

Ready To Learn provides educational programming for tens of millions of American children, including *Between the Lions*, *DragonTales*, *Clifford*, and *Sesame Street*. The unique national-local partnership between PBS and local stations supports both the development and distribution of educational programming and the extension of this programming into the community, using specially developed curriculum and community outreach activities. The Ready To Learn service is designed to build partnerships with local community organizations such as childcare centers, schools, libraries, businesses, civic groups, and government agencies facilitated through local public television stations.

Through this extensive national-local partnership, approximately eight million children have benefited from the outreach component of the program, better prepared to enter school ready to succeed. This year, Public Television is requesting \$32 million in fiscal year 2006 to expand the reach and programming supported by Ready To Learn.

Ready To Teach uses technology to help train elementary and secondary school teachers in core curriculum subjects. It is a teacher professional development program that joins the power of multimedia content with facilitated training modules

in conjunction with local accredited higher ed institutions. To date, the 80 Ready To Teach stations have reached tens of thousands of teachers. Ready To Teach continues to grow in terms of both station and teacher participation; thus for fiscal year 2006, we request \$17 million to continue this effective program.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you, Senator Cochran, Senator Stevens, Senator Harkin, and your colleagues on this subcommittee for your unswerving support of public broadcasting. Time and again—through good times and bad—you have made it possible for public television and radio to fulfill their role to the local communities they serve. Thank you.

Senator SPECTER. Thank you very much, Mr. Lawson.

The final witness on this panel is Mr. David Boaz, Executive Vice President of the Cato Institute. Prior to joining Cato in 1981, he was Executive Director of the Council for a Competitive Economy. He has played a key role in the development of the Cato Institute and the libertarian movement, a graduate of Vanderbilt University.

We appreciate your coming in this morning, Mr. Boaz, and we look forward to your testimony.

STATEMENT OF DAVID BOAZ, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, CATO INSTITUTE

Mr. BOAZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman and Senator Inouye. Thank you for the opportunity to provide a little diversity on this table and to explain why I think taxpayer funding for the Corporation of Public Broadcasting should be eliminated. I will touch briefly on several arguments in my oral discussion and I will save the most important for last.

First, we have a \$400 billion deficit and Congress and the Appropriations Committees should be looking for opportunities to cut nonessential spending. In a world of 500 channels and the World Wide Web, government-funded radio and training networks are nonessential.

Second, public broadcasting is welfare for the rich. In their public defenses, officials of CPB wax eloquent about bringing “Sesame Street” and Shakespeare to poor and isolated children. In talking to their advertisers, however, they are more candid. The audiences for PBS and NPR are the best educated, most professional, and richest audiences in broadcasting. Their cultural programming reflects elite tastes and I like a lot of it myself. But I think that we upper middle class people should pay for our own art and entertainment.

Third, NPR and PBS can survive privatization. As they often remind us, they get only 15 percent of their revenue from the Federal Government. Mr. Chairman, families and businesses in Pennsylvania often deal with 15 percent losses in their income. It is not fun, but they do it. The \$2.5 billion public broadcasting complex can survive and prosper without Federal tax dollars.

Fourth, in news and public affairs programming, bias is inevitable. Any reporter or editor has to choose what is important. It is impossible to make such decisions without a framework, a perspective, a view of how the world works. A careful listener to NPR would notice a preponderance of reports on racism, sexism, and environmental destruction, reflecting a particular perspective on what is most important in our world. David Fanning, the executive producer of PBS’s “Front Line,” responds to questions of bias by saying: “We ask hard questions to people in power. That is anathema to some people in Washington these days,” unquote. But there has

never been a “Front Line” documentary on the burden of taxes of the number of people who have died because Federal regulations keep drugs off the market, or the way that State governments have abused the rule of law in their pursuit of tobacco companies, or the number of people who use guns to prevent crime. Those hard questions just do not occur to liberal journalists.

Anyone who got all his news from NPR would never know that Americans of all races live longer, healthier, and in more comfort than ever before in history or that the environment has been getting steadily cleaner.

That brings me to my major concern. We would not want the Federal Government to publish a national newspaper. Neither should we have a government television network and a government radio network. If anything should be kept separate from government and politics, it is the news and public affairs programming that informs Americans about government and its policies. When government brings us the news, with all the inevitable bias and spin, the government is putting its thumb on the scales of democracy.

Journalists should not work for the Government. Journalists should not have officials of the Government looking over their shoulders. And taxpayers should not be forced to subsidize news and public affairs programming.

Therefore I urge you, not merely to reduce, but to eliminate taxpayer funding for public broadcasting. Now, even if this committee comes to my conclusion that taxpayer funding for radio and television networks is imprudent and constitutionally unfounded, I recognize that you may hesitate to withdraw a funding stream that stations count on. Even though Federal funding is only about 15 percent of public broadcasting revenues, you might choose to phase out the funding, perhaps on a 5-year schedule.

PREPARED STATEMENT

The total funding request for this year is about \$500 million. Congress could reduce it by \$100 million a year, leaving the CPB entirely free of taxpayer funding and of Federal intervention in what journalists do at the end of 5 years.

Thank you for your attention, Senators.

[The statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DAVID BOAZ

Thank you for the opportunity to testify on taxpayer funding for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and by extension for National Public Radio and the Public Broadcasting System. I shall argue that Americans should not be taxed to fund a national broadcast network and that Congress should therefore terminate the funding for CPB.

We wouldn’t want the Federal Government to publish a national newspaper. Neither should we have a government television network and a Government radio network. If anything should be kept separate from Government and politics, it’s the news and public affairs programming that informs Americans about Government and its policies. When Government brings us the news—with all the inevitable bias and spin—the Government is putting its thumb on the scales of democracy. Journalists should not work for the Government. Taxpayers should not be forced to subsidize news and public-affairs programming.

Much of the recent debate about tax-funded broadcasting has centered on whether there is a bias, specifically a liberal bias, at NPR and PBS. I would argue that bias is inevitable. Any reporter or editor has to choose what’s important. It’s impossible

to make such decisions without a framework, a perspective, a view of how the world works.

As a libertarian, I have an outsider's perspective on both liberal and conservative bias. And I'm sympathetic to some of public broadcasting's biases, such as its tilt toward gay rights, freedom of expression, and social tolerance and its deep skepticism toward the religious right. And I share many of the cultural preferences of its programmers and audience, for theater, independent cinema, history, and the like. The problem is not so much a particular bias as the existence of any bias.

Many people have denied the existence of a liberal bias at NPR and PBS. Of course, the most effective bias is one that most listeners or viewers don't perceive. That can be the subtle use of adjectives or frameworks—for instance, a report that “Congress has failed to pass a health care bill” clearly leaves the impression that a health care bill is a good thing, and Congress has “failed” a test. Compare that to language like “Congress turned back a Republican effort to cut taxes for the wealthy.” There the listener is clearly being told that something bad almost happened, but Congress “turned back” the threat.

A careful listener to NPR would notice a preponderance of reports on racism, sexism, and environmental destruction. David Fanning, executive producer of “Frontline,” PBS's documentary series, responds to questions of bias by saying, “We ask hard questions to people in power. That's anathema to some people in Washington these days.” But there has never been a “Frontline” documentary on the burden of taxes, or the number of people who have died because federal regulations keep drugs off the market, or the way that state governments have abused the law in their pursuit of tobacco companies, or the number of people who use guns to prevent crime. Those “hard questions” just don't occur to liberal journalists.

Anyone who got all his news from NPR would never know that Americans of all races live longer, healthier, and in more comfort than ever before in history, or that the environment has been getting steadily cleaner.

In Washington, I have the luxury of choosing from two NPR stations. On Wednesday evening, June 29, a Robert Reich commentary came on. I switched to the other station, which was broadcasting a Daniel Schorr commentary. That's not just liberal bias, it's a liberal roadblock.

In the past few weeks, as this issue has been debated, I've noted other examples. A common practice is labeling conservatives but not liberals in news stories—that is, listeners are warned that the conservative guests have a political agenda but are not told that the other guests are liberals. Take a story on the Supreme Court that identified legal scholar Bruce Fein correctly as a conservative but did not label liberal scholars Pamela Karlan and Akhil Amar. Or take the long and glowing reviews of two leftist agitprop plays, one written by Robert Reich and performed on Cape Cod and another written by David Hare and performed in Los Angeles. I think we can be confident that if a Reagan Cabinet official wrote a play about how stupid and evil liberals are—the mirror image of Reich's play—it would not be celebrated on NPR. And then there was the effusive report on Pete Seeger, the folksinger who was a member of the Communist Party, complete with a two-hour online concert, to launch the Fourth of July weekend.

And if there were any doubt about the political spin of NPR and PBS, it was surely ended when a congressional subcommittee voted to cut the funding for CPB. Who swung into action? Moveon.org, Common Cause, and various left-wing media pressure groups. They made “defending PBS” the top items on their websites, they sent out millions of emails, they appeared on radio and television shows in order to defend an effective delivery system for liberal ideas. Public broadcasters worked hand in glove with those groups, for instance linking from the NPR website to those groups' sites.

There are many complaints today about political interference in CPB, PBS, and NPR. I am sympathetic to those complaints. No journalist wants political appointees looking over his shoulder. But political interference is entirely a consequence of political funding. As long as the taxpayers fund something, their representatives have the authority to investigate how the taxpayers' money is being spent. Recall the criticism directed at PBS in 1994 for broadcasting *Tales of the City*, which has gay characters. Because of the political pressure, PBS decided not to produce the sequel, *More Tales of the City*. It appeared on Showtime and generated little political controversy because Showtime isn't funded with tax dollars. Remove the tax funding, and NPR and PBS would be free from political interference, free to be as daring and innovative and provocative as they like.

One dirty little secret that NPR and PBS don't like to acknowledge in public debate is the wealth of their listeners and viewers. But they're happy to tell their advertisers about the affluent audience they're reaching. In 1999 NPR commissioned Mediamark Research to study its listeners. NPR then enthusiastically told adver-

tisers that its listeners are 66 percent wealthier than the average American, three times as likely to be college graduates, and 150 percent more likely to be professionals or managers.

But perhaps that was an unusual year? Mediamark's 2003 study found the same pattern. As NPR explained, based on the 2003 study:

Public radio listeners are driven to learn more, to earn more, to spend more, and to be more involved in their communities. They are leaders and decision makers, both in the boardroom and in the town square. They are more likely to exert their influence on their communities in all types of ways—from voting to volunteering.

Public radio listeners are dynamic—they do more. They are much more likely than the general public to travel to foreign nations, to attend concerts and arts events, and to exercise regularly. They are health conscious, and are less likely to have serious health problems. Their media usage patterns reflect their active lifestyles, they tend to favor portable media such as newspapers or radio.

As consumers, they are more likely to have a taste for products that deliver on the promise of quality. Naturally, they tend to spend more on products and services.

Specifically, the report found, compared with the general public, NPR listeners are

- 55 percent less likely to have a household income below \$30,000
- 117 percent more likely to have a household income above \$150,000
- 152 percent more likely to have a home valued at \$500,000 or more
- 194 percent more likely to travel to France
- 326 percent more likely to read the New Yorker
- 125 percent more likely to own bonds
- 125 percent more likely to own a Volvo.

PBS has similar demographics. PBS boasts that its viewers are:

- 60 percent more likely to have a household income above \$75,000
- 139 percent more likely to have a graduate degree
- 98 percent more likely to be a CEO
- 132 percent likely to have a home valued at \$500,000 or more
- 315 percent more likely to have stocks valued at \$75,000 or more
- 278 percent more likely to have spent at least \$6000 on a foreign vacation in the past year.

Tax-funded broadcasting is a giant income transfer upward: the middle class is taxed to pay for news and entertainment for the upper middle class. It's no accident that you hear ads for Remy Martin and "private banking services" on NPR, not for Budweiser and free checking accounts.

Defenders of the tax-funded broadcast networks often point out that only about 15 percent of their funding comes from the Federal Government. Indeed, NPR and PBS have been quite successful at raising money from foundations, members, and business enterprises. Given that, they could certainly absorb a 15 percent revenue loss. Businesses and nonprofit organizations often deal with larger revenue fluctuations than that. It isn't fun, but it happens. In a time of \$400 billion deficits, Congress should be looking for nonessential spending that could be cut. Tax-funded broadcasting is no longer an infant industry; it's a healthy \$2.5 billion enterprise that might well discover it liked being free of political control for a paltry 15 percent cut.

Finally, I would note that the Constitution provides no authority for a Federal broadcasting system. Members of Congress once took seriously the constraints imposed on them by the Constitution. In 1794 James Madison, the father of the Constitution, rose on the floor of the House and declared that he could not "undertake to lay his finger on that article of the Federal Constitution which granted a right to Congress of expending, on objects of benevolence, the money of their constituents." In 1887, exactly 100 years after the Constitution was drafted, President Grover Cleveland made a similar point when he vetoed a bill to buy seeds for Texas farmers suffering from a drought, saying he could "find no warrant for such an appropriation in the Constitution." Things had changed by 1935, when President Roosevelt wrote to Congress, "I hope your committee will not permit doubts as to constitutionality, however reasonable, to block the suggested legislation." I suggest that this committee take note of the fact that no article of the Constitution authorizes a national broadcast network.

Even if this committee comes to the conclusion that taxpayer funding for radio and television networks is imprudent and constitutionally unfounded, I recognize that you may hesitate to withdraw a funding stream that stations count on. In that regard, I would note again that federal funding is only about 15 percent of public broadcasting revenues. But you might also phase out the funding, perhaps on a 5-year schedule. The total funding request for this year is about \$500 million. Con-

gress might decide to reduce it by \$100 million a year, leaving the CPB entirely free of federal taxpayer funding at the end of 5 years.

But Congress's resolve in such matters is not trusted. Recall the 1996 Freedom to Farm Act, which likewise promised to phase out farm subsidies. Barely two years had passed when Congress began providing "emergency relief payments" to make up for the scheduled reductions. This time, if Congress pledges to phase out broadcasting subsidies, it needs to make sure that its decision sticks.

A healthy democracy needs a free and diverse press. Americans today have access to more sources of news and opinion than ever before. Deregulation has produced unprecedented diversity—more broadcast networks than before, cable networks, satellite television and radio, the Internet. If there was at some point a diversity argument for NPR and PBS, it is no longer valid. We do not need a government news and opinion network. More importantly, we should not require taxpayers to pay for broadcasting that will inevitably reflect a particular perspective on politics and culture. The marketplace of democracy should be a free market, in which the voices of citizens are heard, with no unfair advantage granted by Government to one participant.

Senator SPECTER. Thank you very much, Mr. Boaz.

We have been joined by Senator Durbin. Would you care, Senator Durbin, at this point to make an opening statement?

Senator DURBIN. I can put it in the record. I would just like to ask some questions.

Senator SPECTER. Without objection, his statement will be put in the record.

[The statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR RICHARD J. DURBIN

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for holding this hearing today. I want to welcome all the witnesses, and look forward to their testimony.

Like millions of parents around the nation, I am a strong supporter of public broadcasting for all the great educational opportunities it provides to our children. Over one third of all public broadcasts aired on weekdays are dedicated to children's programming. More important than what children see on public television is what they don't see—commercials about junk food and toys, interruptions throughout a program, violence, adult themes, and content simply not suitable for children.

Public Broadcasting Service provides more than just a wide range of programs for children's learning. PBS also provides online learning games and activities for children, as well as resources—including workshops and free books—for parents, caregivers, and educators to further enhance the academic and pro-social skills-learning experience for the children. These high quality tools, many of which are developed jointly with the U.S. Department of Education, have been proven to help build our children's literacy and school-readiness skills.

I am also a supporter of public broadcasting because of the value it adds to smaller towns and rural counties throughout Illinois and elsewhere. Sixty-five million Americans live in rural areas, yet many of these households do not have cable and broadband access. Free, over-the-air, public educational television continues to be a critical asset to rural Americans.

Thus, there is no question in my mind when it comes to fully funding the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and the other requests made by the public broadcasting community. It is a bargain to think that we can have such an abundance of quality programs for the entire year at the cost of a little more than \$1 of public funding per person in America.

Public funding is especially important for smaller or rural stations that depend on the federal funding as seed money to plan out their operations for the upcoming years. For these stations, the federal funds we provide each year make up a larger portion of their annual budget than stations in other parts of the country. But, unlike their counterparts in big cities, rural public stations simply do not have the fundraising bases—such as large pool of individual, corporate, and foundation donors—that could potentially replace any shortfall in federal funding.

I look forward to working with the Chairman and the members of this subcommittee to ensure that every item asked for by our local stations can be met in our appropriations process this week and beyond.

I also look forward to clearing the air today of several controversies surrounding recent activities at the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. I am very concerned to read in the press that there may be partisan political activities taking place at CPB,

and I hope we will receive some straight answers to these lingering questions from representatives of CPB.

Mr. Kenneth Tomlinson, who appears before us today as CPB's chairman of the board of directors, has been associated with many of these allegations. There are reports that he has made personnel decisions based on partisan or political factors and that he has influenced the content of programs that are aired on public broadcasting. These allegations rise to such a serious level that CPB's own inspector general has initiated an internal investigation.

One episode is particularly troubling. According to press reports, Mr. Tomlinson paid an outside consultant over \$14,000 of taxpayer funds to have him monitor certain public broadcast programs to determine the political ideology of guests who appear on these shows. The consultant's report is now in the public domain, and its conclusions are suspicious, at best. For example, according to Mr. Tomlinson's consultant, my Republican colleague, Senator Chuck Hagel, is a "liberal" because he happened to disagree with some of President Bush's positions on a show that aired on public broadcast. The report is full of such ridiculous assertions.

I have also read that Mr. Tomlinson personally advocated for the addition of a program to the PBS lineup hosted by editors of the Wall Street Journal's editorial page, in his self-described attempt to balance the perceived liberal bias of "NOW" with Bill Moyers. This comes at the same time when CPB is insisting on tying new funding for PBS to an agreement that PBS would commit to strict new standard of "objectivity and balance" in its programs.

Apparently, Mr. Tomlinson believes public broadcasting is too liberal, even though a series of focus groups and two national surveys conducted at CPB's own request concluded that the public perception is otherwise. Specifically, the survey of over 1,000 adults found that only 21 percent thought the Public Broadcasting Service had a liberal bias and 22 percent thought the National Public Radio had a liberal bias. The survey found that 12 percent thought PBS had a conservative bias and 9 percent thought the same of NPR. This means that two-thirds of those surveyed believed there was no apparent bias on PBS or NPR.

Additionally, the survey conducted on CPB's behalf found that 80 percent of respondents had a "favorable" opinion of public broadcasting, while only 10 percent had an "unfavorable" opinion. More than half of the respondents (55 percent) also said that PBS programming was "fair and balanced," while NPR received an even higher approval rating of 79 percent.

The internal survey results and the overwhelming support expressed by the public as evidenced by the recent vote in the House of Representatives to restore funding for public broadcast seem to indicate that perhaps Mr. Tomlinson should rethink what he believes is in the best interests of the consumers of public broadcasting.

Senator SPECTER. Mr. Boaz, let us start with the question that you raised, that public broadcasting can survive without Federal funding. Ms. Mitchell, can public broadcasting survive without Federal funding, as Mr. Boaz suggests?

Ms. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, I would respectfully disagree with the principle of Mr. Boaz's arguments. It is a principle of this democracy that, while we have very successful private bookstores, we still invest in private—in public libraries. And we have private schools, but we invest in public schools.

This Congress saw the benefit of setting aside public spectrum for public service broadcasting and that is, it seems to me, a great use of public funds, using the power of media to inform and engage citizens so that the great work of this democracy might go forward.

Senator SPECTER. Ms. Mitchell, I am not quite sure of your answer. Can public broadcasting survive without Federal funding?

Ms. MITCHELL. The taxpayer dollars, Mr. Chairman, are leveraged with private money. So that 15 percent is a hugely important critical foundation for not only the station services, because most of the money, as Ms. Harrison represented, goes directly to the stations, and there they leverage from the 15 or 20 percent of their budget that is provided by appropriations, they leverage all of this private investment from foundations, corporations, and, yes, view-

ers like you, who still voluntarily support at a level that is the largest single percentage.

Senator SPECTER. Mr. Lawson, the point is made by Mr. Boaz that there ought not to be a national newspaper and analogizes that to public broadcasting. Let me ask you a two-part question. Would you agree that there ought not to be a national newspaper, part one? And part two, does public broadcasting—and I am going to give Mr. Boaz a chance to respond to this, too—come anywhere in the range of constituting what would be a national media organ?

Mr. LAWSON. No, sir, I do not think there should be a national newspaper and I do not think public broadcasting in any way constitutes a national media organ. As I said in my statement, we are the last of the locally controlled media. That is a characteristic of American public broadcasting that is different from any other country. We are not the BBC, we are not NHK, we are not centrally managed. It is about local control.

I can tell you, if the 15 percent went away, first you would see stations serving rural America go dark. Secondly, even for the big market stations there would be so much pressure on them to replace that money. The Federal money is the foundation, it is the seed money. All the other money we raise is based on that, and you would see enormous pressure on even the largest stations to become more commercial.

So localism is the key to public broadcasting in the United States.

Senator SPECTER. Mr. Boaz, you raise a very fundamental point here on the kinds of programming and have identified a series of subjects which you note that the "Front Line" documentary has never addressed, such as burden of taxes or the regulatory system or pursuit of private companies. Has "Front Line" or other similar programs on public broadcasting addressed any of the issues which you think would provide balance on the kind of hard questions which ought to be asked?

Mr. BOAZ. I am sure that no program has been completely unbalanced. But I am not aware of "Front Line"—I did actually check with "Front Line" on these specific claims and they acknowledge that, no, they have never done a documentary on those. Certainly some of the questions that "Front Line" deals with I think are important and sometimes "Front Line's" programming is I think balanced.

But I do not think you can watch it or listen to National Public Radio, which I do at least twice a day, and not get the impression that there is a particular perspective guiding it. As I say in my written testimony, I agree with some of that perspective. I am sympathetic to NPR's skepticism about the religious right, its support for social tolerance and freedom of expression. But I do think that is a perspective.

I have a political opinion and so do the editors and producers at NPR. So I do think it is impossible to avoid some sort of perspective or theme running through your programming and I think that "Front Line," the other documentary series, NPR, have not avoided that bias.

HOUSE APPROPRIATION BILL

Senator SPECTER. Ms. Harrison, the Appropriations Committee is going to have to consider the issue of digital transition. The House did not provide a direct appropriation for digital transition, but instead gave CPB authority to carve out funds from station grants.

To what extent would the absence of a direct grant for digital transition and a requirement that the money come out of station grants be problematic for you?

Ms. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, if I could answer that question by folding in some of the things that we have been discussing here today. Public broadcasting is our strongest connected community at a time when we need an informed citizenry. Even though we have multiple channels, it seems amazing; the more channels we have, the more dumbing down occurs through programs, whether it is aimed at children or it is aimed at people who are older.

If we have to give up the money for this very, very important digital technology, it will come directly out of the sole purpose for which public broadcasting exists, and that is to be a network of knowledge. We will have to meet with the stations, the general managers, and the cuts will be very bad.

I feel so strongly about the purpose of public broadcasting as an educator, and now as we have increasingly more young people in this country who do not understand our history or civics, we have new Americans—and you know, sometimes those moms and their kids are sitting in front of these children's programs and they are learning English, they are learning about our country. If we did not have public broadcasting today, we would have to re-invent it.

I come to this job from a former position where in the early 90s exchanges were cut. We thought technology was going to enable us to increase mutual understanding between the people of the United States and other countries. What we found out is the people to people connection is important. This community connection is vital to our country's strength and I think to the strength of our democracy.

Senator SPECTER. We have since been joined by Senator Stevens, formerly the chairman of the full committee. Before going to Senator Inouye for his opening round of questions, Senator Stevens, would you care to make an opening statement?

STATEMENT OF SENATOR TED STEVENS

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I am sorry to be late. To confess, my mind is still in Alaska on the fishing stream, and there is 4 hours time difference, too. But I do appreciate the opportunity to come here and I hope I can stay through a round of questioning.

I believe that the full amount of the request should be supported by the subcommittee and moneys deleted by the House be restored. But I also believe that what Mr. Boaz has just said is true, that there are signs in portions of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and the Broadcasting Service which indicate that there are unfortunate trends in some places to take on political issues in a way that demonstrates a bias.

It is my judgment that there should be no bias, no leaning to the right or to the left by management or by those who operate the stations. The answer that I think you should have given, Ms. Mitchell, to the chairman's question are the Federal dollars necessary, can these organizations survive without Federal money, the answer has got to be no. In my State there are many places where you do not have sufficient base for public support. Our State helps by paying in some areas the telephone services for these various stations. But there are other areas in the country which do not have public support capability, financial support capability.

I do believe that the Federal money is not only seed money for the system, but it is absolutely necessary to assure that the system will be extended to wherever there is a need, rather than wherever there is the public support base for financial contributions.

But I thank you for holding the hearing. I do think that members of the Congress ought to calm down. This system needs our support. I remember so well when we started some of the concepts of matching funds. We took away the actual matching fund requirement that existed for a little while. But I do believe that this is an essential service.

My mind goes back to "The Adams Papers" or to the rebroadcasting of some of the BBC programming that we would not have had otherwise. I know this system is needed by the country, but I deplore the fact that there are some people within it that want to exercise their political bias in delivering it. That is your problem. I think the board's problem is to get rid of that and restore the balance that existed in the past in the system and really not look to the left or the right, but just look wherever there is bias going either direction and set the record straight so we will not face this challenge that the House has delivered.

I think they were right in delivering it, because I think you are all here today to really react to the cause of that deletion. I think our job is to put the money back and convince them that there has been a wakeup call, that the bells have rung and that people have heard the message, and we are all going to make this system work.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator SPECTER. Thank you very much, Senator Stevens.

Senator Inouye.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR DANIEL K. INOUE

Senator INOUE. Thank you very much.

AUDIENCE DEMOGRAPHICS

I would like to assure the panel here that I fully support full funding of what you are requesting. I would like to ask Ms. Harrison or Ms. Mitchell, do you believe that in the case of your operation monies—funded by the taxpayers—are they being spent to cater only to the rich and the educated? That is what was said here.

Ms. MITCHELL. Our viewers and our supporters, Senator Inouye, reflect and mirror very closely the demographic makeup of our communities, and that is in terms of income and education and ethnicity and cultural background. I would like to take Mr. Boaz on some of my visits to our stations, where he would meet these

people and see their faces, the faces of caregivers in rural Mississippi who have no books in the home, who are unprepared themselves, and often, as Pat said, even without the literacy skills they need, much less the skills to pass it on to the children in their care.

In those places and the rural places in this country, all over this country, we are there providing caregivers with materials they would not have otherwise: free books, training for these caregivers, literacy skills that prepare those children, usually the most disadvantaged.

I would also point out that among all the other children's programs that are on television, ours are the only ones that begin with educators, that begin with clear learning objectives, and that are based in every way, through characters, scenarios, to appeal to every child in this country, so that no parent or caregiver is left behind.

Mr. Chairman, may I take this moment also to say that in a time when, as Senator Stevens referenced, the trust in media has never been lower in this country—and I think there is good reason for that. And since our trust level is so high, we felt it very important for us to review the editorial standards that guide our program decisionmaking. More than a year ago we put together a blue ribbon panel of journalists and we asked them to look at our programming from every perspective: Was it reflecting the needs of our communities that we knew from the public opinion polls, and then the editorial standards, were they ensuring that we complied, not only with the statutory obligations for objectivity and balance, but that we went beyond that and clarified what we mean by accuracy, reliability, transparency.

Those new guidelines are in place and we believe that they will further ensure that on all subjects—and those subjects that Mr. Boaz referenced I am going to pass along to "Front Line" this afternoon; they sound like subjects we should be looking at—that on all subjects we represent the diversity of perspectives that is in this country.

Ms. HARRISON. Senator Inouye, I welcome this opportunity to address your question and also in an oblique way Mr. Boaz. CPB is the only organization within public broadcasting that really is cast to look at the concerns you expressed: Are we taking care of minorities? Are we looking at rural communities? Are we doing the outreach which only public broadcasting can do, prior to a program and after, involving communities?

My father when he died had Alzheimer's. I only wish that my mother had been able to access a recent program that public broadcasting did on Alzheimer's that was not just a program; it had a shelf life long after the program was over. It involved caretakers and organizations. After you watched this series, you felt there was some light at the end of the tunnel.

Commercial television cannot do this. This is the focus that CPB has and the mandate that we have, that it is not an elite programming entity, that we look at the big picture. Children more and more—I keep harping on that—if we do not focus on children, we are not going to have a very positive big picture for anyone across the line of all issues.

Thank you.

IMPORTANCE OF FEDERAL FUNDING

Senator INOUE. Do you believe that our funding, Federal funding, is in our national interest?

Ms. HARRISON. I certainly do. You know, I do not want to appear as an instant expert. I have only been on this job for 4½ working days. But what surprised me was that in 1975 in an amendment to the Public Broadcasting Act President Ford at the time not only wanted Federal funding, he suggested it be 5 years out. Also, there is the authority to fund up to 40 percent, and the percentage has been going down. So we are at 15 percent now. I think the highest was 19 percent. 15 percent is modest, and I think all credit to the stations who have raised 85 percent of what they need to do, which keeps it local.

PREPARED STATEMENT

Senator INOUE. I notice my time is up, sir.
[The statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR DANIEL K. INOUE

Since its creation as part of the 1967 Public Broadcasting Act, public broadcasting has pursued an ambitious mandate to provide educational, cultural and informational programming that takes creative risks while serving traditionally unserved and underserved populations.

Public broadcasting is a unique voice in the local community that we have come to trust and depend on. A recent survey conducted by The Roper Center for Public Opinion Research determined that public broadcasting is one of America's most trusted institutions.

Public television has set the standard with award-winning documentaries, outstanding children's programming, and in-depth news and public affairs programming that cannot be found on commercial television channels. The current audience for National Public Radio programming is 26 million listeners each week, up 97 percent over the past decade, as more and more Americans seek thoughtful analysis of the important issues facing our nation and our communities.

I am proud to be a long-time proponent of public broadcasting and believe that public broadcasting has been a tremendous success.

The funding cuts proposed by the House are ill-advised and poorly timed. As this Committee is well-aware, massive consolidation in the media industry along with a general coarsening of public discourse on the commercial airwaves is making it more and more difficult for families to find quality programming that is suitable for children. It makes no sense to undermine the primary place on the channel lineup that parents and families trust the most.

I am concerned not only about the funding cuts but also about the recent controversies reported in the press over possible misuse of taxpayer funds and the lack of transparency in decisions made by the Chairman of the CPB Board.

As a result of the current budget deficit, many important programs face funding cuts. These are not easy choices to make. While I am pleased that some of the funding for public broadcasting was restored by the House, funding for several important programs has been eliminated.

Funding for "Ready to Learn," which supports high quality children's programming, and grants supporting the transition from analog to digital broadcasting and the interconnection services that link public broadcasting stations together were all canceled out by our House colleagues. Traditionally, the Senate has restored this funding and I hope that Senators Specter and Harkin will continue to champion these important programs.

In particular, I question the wisdom of eliminating the funding to help local stations make the transition from analog to digital television, while at the same time, the Commerce Committees in both the House and Senate are considering legislation to complete the digital transition.

Public broadcasters are leading the way in the digital transition. More than 87 percent of public television stations are operating in digital. Public television licensees have embraced new services enabled by digital technology. Many stations already utilize multicasting capabilities to provide "PBS Kids" programming as a dedi-

cated children's channel and to provide educational services through "PBS You" as a dedicated channel.

Even without a government mandate, public radio stations are moving quickly to implement digital technology with 79 public radio stations broadcasting in digital and over 300 with licensed digital technology.

The use of taxpayer funds by the Chairman of CPB to hire lobbyists and consultants raises serious concerns. Not only do such actions potentially violate the prohibitions against advocacy in current law, but the fact that these steps were apparently taken without consultation with either the full Board or the President and CEO of CPB is extremely troubling.

The Inspector General is currently investigating whether these decisions violate the law and the CPB's bylaws, and I will look forward to his full report on those concerns. Without accountability and transparency in the use of taxpayer funds, the legitimacy of these actions is rightly questioned.

Concerns have also been raised that the CPB is straying from its statutory obligation to act as a heat shield between Congress and programming decisions. The Public Broadcasting Act requires the CPB "to carry out its purposes and functions and engage in its activities in ways that will most effectively assure the maximum freedom of the public telecommunications entities . . . from interference with, or control of, program content or other activities."

Thank you Mr. Chairman and I look forward to the testimony of the witnesses today on these important issues.

Senator SPECTER. Thank you very much, Senator Inouye.

Senator Stevens.

Senator STEVENS. Senator Durbin.

Senator SPECTER. Well, the early bird rule would go to Senator Durbin, but the practice of the committee has been to alternate between the sides.

Senator STEVENS. I am not prepared yet.

Senator SPECTER. Senator Durbin, you have the floor.

POLITICAL BALANCE IN PUBLIC BROADCASTING

Senator DURBIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I thank the panel. I especially thank you, Mr. Chairman, for calling this hearing because if your experience is like mine, this is an issue on the minds of a lot of people, what is happening to public broadcasting. Are we going through some effort now to politicize this, to change the nature and philosophy of something that we value very much in this country?

I am a fan, have been for a long time. Obviously, I am not alone. When you read the surveys of people asking them what they think about public broadcasting, it is pretty good. Over a thousand adults polled, PBS and NPR had an 80 percent favorable rating. Not a single one of us on this side of the panel would look askance at that number. 80 percent favorable is pretty good.

When you ask if it is fair and balanced, not to steal a line from some other company, 55 percent said PBS programming is, 79 percent said NPR is fair and balanced.

That is why it strikes me as odd, Mr. Tomlinson, that we are on this crusade of a sort here, this mission, to change what is going on. I do not quite get it, understand what your agenda is here and what you are trying to achieve.

I read and I watched over the break Mr. Moyers' speech in St. Louis, ordered a copy online, read it twice. It is troubling to me. I think Bill Moyers' program now is a balanced program and I think most people would agree with it. Now, Mr. Mann that you hired or someone hired to monitor this program came up with some

rather strange conclusions about who is a liberal and who is a conservative and who is a friend of the President and who is not.

Even I think in your opening statement you have tried to clarify that you do not stand by his conclusions, for example on Senator Hagel, the characterization of Senator Hagel as liberal and such. Maybe you do think he is a liberal. I do not know what that conclusion might be.

But the point I would like to get to is this. Let us go to a specific question. Under section 19 of Public Broadcasting Act you are required to mandate political balance on all shows. It has been reported that you have championed the addition of "Wall Street Journal Editorial Report" to the PBS lineup and that you have raised money for that purpose. I would like you to clarify. If you did that, how much money was raised? What was your purpose in bringing in the Wall Street Journal, which, as has been noted, is a publication owned by a company that has been very profitable and would not appear to need a subsidy to put on a show?

Mr. TOMLINSON. I think Senator Stevens hit the nail on the head: no bias. No bias on the left, no bias on the right. If we have programs, like the Moyers program, that tilt clearly to the left, then I think according to the law we need to have a program that goes along with it that tilts to the right and let the people decide.

Senator DURBIN. Let me ask you about this "clearly to the left" bias on the Moyers show. How did you reach that conclusion? Did you watch a lot of those shows?

Mr. TOMLINSON. I watched a lot of those shows, and I think Mr. Mann's research demonstrates that the program was clearly liberal advocacy journalism. It was good broadcasting. Bill Moyers is a very capable broadcaster. But it seems to me we should be able to agree that we do not want bias, and if we do in the interest of provoking debate, if we have some bias on public television, let us balance it out in the course of the evening.

Senator DURBIN. So what was Mr. Mann's expertise? Why did you happen to hire him? According to Senator Dorgan, who has seen the raw data, he was paid thousands of dollars. His data, riddled with spelling errors, was faxed to you from a Hallmark store in downtown Indianapolis. What is this man's background for judging a program like Moyers' program and whether it is liberal or not?

Mr. TOMLINSON. He worked for 20 years for the National Journalism Center, which is a 401(c)(3) organization.

Senator DURBIN. National Journalism Center?

Mr. TOMLINSON. National Journalism Center.

Senator DURBIN. What is that?

Mr. TOMLINSON. But the point of watching—

Senator DURBIN. Excuse me. What is the National Journalism Center?

Mr. TOMLINSON. It is a center here in Washington that funds internships for—

Senator DURBIN. And they are straight down the middle of the road, moderate, centrist group, right and left?

Mr. TOMLINSON. I think it qualified for 401(c)(3) support. I do not think it was regarded as right of center.

But the point is, it is like Bob Dylan said, you do not need a weather vane to see which way the wind is blowing. It was very clear that the Moyers program was liberal advocacy journalism. I wanted a statistical basis because I did not think people were responding appropriately. We got the statistical basis, and as soon as—

Senator DURBIN. From Mr. Mann?

Mr. TOMLINSON. From Mr. Mann's research. And as soon as we got the statistical basis, it turned out other people had determined that that program should be balanced. It was balanced. All this took place something like a year and a half ago.

Senator DURBIN. Well, let me—I have got to get to the basic question here. I will not go through the list of some of Mr. Moyers' more liberal guests—Frank Gaffney, Grover Norquist, Richard Viguier, Paul Gigot—on his liberal program.

Mr. TOMLINSON. It was our experience—

Senator DURBIN. But let me ask you this if I can.

Mr. TOMLINSON. Yes, sir.

Senator DURBIN. Did you feel that it was your responsibility or authority to go out and put together the Wall Street editorial page show and to find subsidy for that? Did you feel that that was your responsibility to do?

Mr. TOMLINSON. I felt that the law required us to reflect balance in our current affairs programming. I was not the only one involved in encouraging a program that represented a diverse point of view from the Moyers show.

Senator DURBIN. So following Mr. Moyers' comments in St. Louis, can we expect you to do the same for "The Nation Magazine?" Are you going to raise \$5 million to make sure they have a show?

Mr. TOMLINSON. I do not see, I do not see today we have a balance problem. We have a 30-minute show "Now" and we have a 30-minute show, "Wall Street Journal." That is balanced. Let the people decide. Balance is common sense.

Senator DURBIN. But Mr. Tomlinson, the people I said at the outset already decided. They thought that the Corporation for Public Broadcasting was presenting balance and they thought that—they gave a high approval rating. You have perceived a problem here which the American people obviously do not perceive.

Mr. TOMLINSON. Well, certainly in terms of "Jim Lehrer News Hour" there is no balance problem. That is great journalism. Public broadcasting has a great reputation in these areas.

We had a period of time a few years ago where I think we were all asleep at the switch in terms of the Moyers program. I never wanted to take the Moyers program off the air.

Senator DURBIN. What do you mean by "asleep at the switch" with the Moyers program? I would like you to tell me a little bit more.

Mr. TOMLINSON. Because we should have been aware that on Friday evening if you presented liberal advocacy journalism for an hour you really should present conservative advocacy journalism for an hour, just for a matter of balance. The law requires balances.

Senator DURBIN. This was your conclusion based on Mr. Mann's investigation?

Mr. TOMLINSON. This was my conclusion when I found that there was a dispute over my view of this program and the general view of this program. I quite frankly have run into next to no serious people who regarded the Moyers program as anything other than good liberal advocacy programming.

Senator DURBIN. Will you accept his invitation to take an hour, go on the air on public television, and to debate that issue?

Mr. TOMLINSON. Absolutely. But you know——

Senator DURBIN. Oh, you will accept it?

Mr. TOMLINSON. Oh, absolutely. But you know, Senator Durbin, Bill Moyers and I both have concluded that this debate is not good for public television.

Senator DURBIN. No, it is not.

Mr. TOMLINSON. There were things that Moyers said in that speech about me that were most inaccurate and unfair. It saddened me to see that. I could have come back in kind. I chose not to. We are for public broadcasting, we are for no bias in public broadcasting. We do not want bias on the right and we do not want bias on the left.

Senator DURBIN. I have gone over my time. I thank the chairman for giving me a couple extra minutes and I will wait for the next round.

Mr. TOMLINSON. Thank you, sir.

Senator SPECTER. I thought we had a little more leeway here, Senator Durbin, than we do on the Judiciary Committee. So the red light was flexible.

Senator Stevens, would you care to question?

PUBLIC TELEVISION INTERCONNECTION SYSTEM

Senator STEVENS. Well, I would clear up the Senator from Illinois' confusion. I think Bill Moyers is biased and I respect him for it. I think he is a very talented spokesman for his point of view in the political spectrum. I applaud you for recognizing that and counterbalancing it. I think your support will demonstrate that in the long run.

But the main thing is I want to get back to the financing of this, because that is the question before us, really. I just was waiting for the information, Mr. Chairman. My State contributed \$5.3 million as a State to public broadcasting stations in Alaska because we recognize the need for the system and to maintain it. I do believe that all States that have similar dependent communities should recognize it and should come forward and support it.

I would like to know whether you can tell me about the concepts that have been left out of this bill this year. The satellite upgrade of \$40 million, the request from the President was deleted. The digital programming of \$45 million was deleted. Each of those had had money in the fiscal year 2005. And the Ready to Learn program of \$32 million was deleted.

Now, those are the items that we are really concerned with. CPB's request was \$430 million. The House brought it down to \$400 million. There are lots of small adjustments that have to be made in these bills this year. I am not as disturbed about that as I am disturbed about the deletion of satellite upgrading, digital programming, and the Ready to Learn program, which I think has

been eminently successful in places like the rural stations that I mentioned in my State.

Who among you would be willing to talk about the satellite upgrade and its necessity? Mr. Lawson, is that you?

Mr. LAWSON. Yes, sir, I will take that one. It has been a Federal responsibility since day 1 to provide for this interconnection between the stations for the distribution of programming. Congress last, with your support, last funded that in the early 1990s. That system is becoming obsolete. The satellite leases are expiring. If that system is not renewed, then we are FedExing tapes around.

This is a system, this is the glue that holds our whole system together in terms of technical infrastructure. The exciting thing about the next generation, right now we are feeding a lot of programming to tape machines. It is expensive, it is very labor-intensive. This system will allow more peer to peer, station to station interaction. They will literally be emailing programs around as attachments to emails.

So you are going to see Alaska and stations all over this country with this new system not only receiving the PBS programming over the satellite, but they themselves will be able to move programming around and share it with other stations, without even having to go through a national organization like PBS.

So the infrastructure for the satellite interconnection is absolutely crucial. Without it we are not connected.

Senator STEVENS. Let me tell you a little history. When I moved to Alaska our programming, such as sports and weekly programming, they were sent up by tapes to Alaska. So if you had a baseball game on Friday on the 1st in Washington, D.C., you would see it on the 8th in Alaska. You know, I soon got out of the habit of watching baseball.

My point is right now what this means is real-time delivery to the country as a whole. Satellite interconnections are available in the South 48. In many places you can use fiber or you can use other connections. But in the rural part of the country that satellite connection is absolutely important.

So I want to assure you that is one thing, and I think in my colleague's State in Hawaii those small stations around the islands—actually, if you put a ring around Hawaii it would be bigger than Alaska; did you know that? We do not let them count the water. Ours is frozen in between, but his is open water.

But the point is we need that.

Now, digital programming, who is going to tell us about the digital programming and the reason for even the President increased it by \$6 million? Who wants to comment on that? Is that yours too, Mr. Lawson? Ms. Harrison?

DIGITAL CONVERSION

Ms. HARRISON. Well, again jumping in probably where I should not, but I, as somebody new to this position, I come with a fresh eye, I do believe. And I am just so impressed. Just to give you an example, there is something called the Think Bright Digital Content Initiative, and that is going to be programming targeted to address five community needs: family literacy, success in school, fam-

ily health, learning disabilities, civic engagement. It is going to also include research and development.

What is really happening as we move into this new technology—and again, that is part of the 1967 mandate—as we keep up with changing technology, so we can be that connector to the community, we are now facing almost a different viewer and listener, not the passive viewer or listener, but the viewer and listener who wants to really have input, who wants to participate.

Now, right now we are saying this is the younger generation. They are learning. In many cases they are way ahead of us. The technology is ahead of us. For public broadcasting to be vital and, as we said, this important connector to community, the technology must be there. We cannot have the programming without the advanced technology. It is going to enable us to do things we had not thought possible before.

I think it is one of the most exciting developments. As we look at the successor generation and how they are involved with computers and downloading on their MP3's, we are going to have a growing group of listeners and viewers who are really going to be there on some of these issues that I mentioned earlier.

Senator STEVENS. My time is up, but if I could I would like to ask one question about Ready to Learn. Ready to Learn money also went up by \$8.7 million, I believe—no, \$7.7 million. Who can explain Ready to Learn to us now?

Ms. MITCHELL. The Ready to Learn grant, Senator, as you know has been a very successful partnership with the Department of Education. Over the last 10 years PBS, our children's programming producers, and our stations have leveraged this grant again to provide new series that are based on educational learning objectives, teaching the most disadvantaged, as well as all of our Nation's preschoolers, the skills that they need for literacy.

In addition, we work with the Department of Education to provide these educational programs and then stations take the largest percentage of these Ready to Learn funds and use them to provide, through experienced educational teams at every station, the kind of workshop, training, and programs that are making the difference in the lives.

We looked at the number. It was 100 million families have been affected by the Ready to Learn programs. Going forward, CPB, PBS, and other teams of producers worked together on our new proposal, looking at how we might engage these new digital technologies to enhance what we are already doing.

If I might augment what Pat said about our leadership in the digital arena, we know how to use these technologies and we know how to use them for public interest and public education.

Senator STEVENS. I am sorry, my time is up. I am informed I made a mistake. I was looking at your request rather than the President's request.

But let me tell you this. Alaska has the highest rate of computer literacy in the Nation on a per capita basis, despite our isolation. The reason is our young people get the computers from the second grade up. But they also, through the local stations that they are watching, have these programs. That makes them relevant to their lives even though they in most instances do not have modem capa-

bility, they do not have the ability to go up. Now, the schools, libraries, and health facilities do, but individual citizens do not have that same access.

So it is very important to us that this kind of concept of Ready to Learn be supported also.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Senator SPECTER. Thank you, Senator Stevens.

BILL MOYERS

Senator Harkin, who is the ranking Democrat on the subcommittee, could not be here this morning. But he asked me to ask this question on his behalf and on his time, although it retraces some of what Senator Durbin has had to say. This question is for you, Mr. Tomlinson.

Mr. Bill Moyers' comment was made in a speech in St. Louis about 2 weeks ago and Senator Harkin would like to know whether you would be willing to take up Mr. Moyers' expression of an interest in a public debate between you and him on the questions you have raised about him and his objectivity. The question that Senator Harkin has is is that a conversation or debate which you would be prepared to engage in with Mr. Moyers publicly?

Mr. TOMLINSON. Absolutely, Mr. Chairman. Let me say, though, that in that speech in St. Louis Mr. Moyers said some most inaccurate things about me. He charged or he implied that in the early 1980s when I was chairman, when I was director of Voice of America, that I was somehow involved in some blacklist scandal. I have never been associated with anything like that.

He implied I was forced out of office because of that. I left my years of service at VOA with general acceptance that I had been a success, as it were.

Now, this thing between Mr. Moyers and me could be a lot of fun. We would have a lot of fun debating on television for an hour about that. It would not be good for public television and I think Mr. Moyers and I both agree that in recent weeks we stopped—we now have balance on that Friday evening offering and we did not think it was in the interest of public broadcasting for us to continue.

Senator SPECTER. Do you think it would be a lot of fun?

Mr. TOMLINSON. It would be a lot of fun.

Senator SPECTER. Would you think it ought to be broadcast on "Saturday Night Live?"

Mr. TOMLINSON. That is probably where it belongs.

Senator SPECTER. How about on public broadcasting, where you have a little more control? I do not think you can control "Saturday Night Live," but would you be willing to have it on public broadcasting?

Mr. TOMLINSON. Yes. As I say—

Ms. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, if I might, Mr. Tomlinson would have to—

Senator SPECTER. Do you want to join in the debate, Ms. Mitchell?

Ms. MITCHELL. No, I just thought it was important to clarify that that is not Mr. Tomlinson's decision, what would go on PBS. That decision is made by PBS management.

Senator SPECTER. We may come to PBS management here. But Mr. Tomlinson has standing to express a view as to whether he would like to have it there or not.

Ms. MITCHELL. We would consider it.

Senator SPECTER. Now that you have considered it, what is your decision?

Ms. MITCHELL. I think your suggestion of "Saturday Night Live" might be a better place.

But in all seriousness, Senator, it just seems important to, as Mr. Tomlinson has said and I think you are hearing from all of us, to focus on the fact that, as Senators on this committee have already indicated, the American public looks at all of our programming and they trust it and they value it, and they do not judge it only in terms of political balance. There are a lot of other balances that we are concerned about.

We are concerned in media about the balance between what is important, what matters in this country, as well as what just amuses us. What entertains us is not as important as what is educating us. Our role as public service media is to use this enormous power to educate, to strengthen family values, and to contribute to the strength of this democracy, and that judges and that guides our decisions about programming.

Senator SPECTER. Well, Senator Harkin is almost out of time. I would perhaps—well, your acceptance of the debate challenge is fine, Mr. Tomlinson. We will now have to find a venue, and perhaps if you cannot find any other venue we can have a hearing before the subcommittee. But I do not know that C-SPAN would be willing to do any more on this subject, but we could see.

Senator Harkin wants to yield back 53 seconds.

CPB INTERCONNECTION REQUEST

Coming back to my own 5 minutes of time, I have asked the question about the digital transmission and the lack of funding in the House bill. Senator Stevens has covered this to an extent, but I want to be sure about your response. The interconnection 10-year lease expires on October 1 next year for the satellite that transmits public radio and television programs. It is going to cost \$120 million. We have already put up almost \$50 million and CPB is requesting an additional \$40 million. The President and the House have both proposed diverting \$52 million from 2006 grants.

Ms. Mitchell, Mr. Lawson, I take it your answer would be the same as on the issue of digital transition, if you did not get funding that it would be very, very problematic?

Mr. LAWSON. Yes, sir, it would. That would come—that money would come directly out of the station operational money and programming money. I would like to point out that the conversion to digital is a Federal mandate and our stations have raised and spent \$1.1 billion to do that. Half of that came from State legislatures. Congress has been generous in the last few years with Federal support and we are sort of over the hump in terms of getting this thing built out. But that final money for the next couple of years is needed, especially for stations serving rural America that do not have the kind of matching money that some of the other stations have.

Senator SPECTER. Thank you very much, Mr. Lawson. We do not have much time. I want to move on to some other questions.

Mr. Boaz, in your written statement you say: "As a libertarian, I have an outsider's perspective on both liberal and conservative bias and I am sympathetic to some of the public broadcasting's biases, such as its tilt toward gay rights, freedom of expression, and social tolerance and its deep skepticism of the religious right."

Picking up on your statement about being sympathetic toward gay rights, let me ask you about the request from Education Secretary Margaret Spellings in January of this year to PBS asking that it not distribute an episode of the children's program "Postcards from Buster" that featured a family with two lesbian moms. PBS agreed not to distribute the program. What is your view of that?

Mr. BOAZ. Well, I am not personally offended by Buster's trip to Vermont. I think it is good to teach social tolerance. But I understand that there are a lot of Americans who do not appreciate that, who did not like the program or would not have if they had seen it. So I understand why Secretary Spellings thought it was her responsibility to interfere.

What I would say in relation to public television is this is why it is a bad idea to have a government-run television station, because Secretary Spellings can write a letter to Fox or CNN saying, hey, I wish you would not run this program, but she has no authority over them. Here, because of the government's funding, the taxpayers fund these networks, therefore the taxpayers are occasionally going to exercise their authority to look at what the stations are running.

I think that is not good. I think it is not good to have political overseers. I am sure that Senators would exercise more oversight if they saw these things more often. I am sure Senators, for instance, are usually in transit or visiting community affairs on Friday nights, so they have not actually seen the Bill Moyers program, because if they did I think it would be difficult to sustain the argument that it was not advocacy journalism, though good advocacy journalism.

But I think the basic point that "Buster" illustrates is the danger of having political oversight of a news and public affairs program.

Senator SPECTER. Ms. Mitchell, who made the decision with respect to "Postcards from Buster" and Secretary Spellings' request?

Ms. MITCHELL. The decision not to distribute the program on the national program service that goes from PBS to our stations was made by PBS management and was made before the letter from Secretary Spellings.

But might I speak just a moment more about this unique partnership and why it has worked so well? The Ready to Learn teams, who include PBS children's producers, a PBS team, station teams, as well as the team at the Department of Education, sit down and very carefully review the objectives of these programs, and they review the subjects that are going to be treated. But when this subject came in we felt that it was of such controversial nature for some of our communities that it was best to go back to what you have heard us all say all morning: public broadcasting is a local institution.

Senator SPECTER. Do you share Mr. Boaz's—my red light just went on, but I want to finish this subject up with a very brief question and then you can expand on your answer. Do you share Mr. Boaz's comment about his concern about the regulatory approach or the decision being made by a public agency on this kind of an issue?

Ms. MITCHELL. No, indeed I do not. The money that has come to PBS and our producers from the Ready to Learn partnership with the Department of Education has made it possible to prepare millions of children in this country for school.

Senator SPECTER. Senator Inouye.

CPB USE OF CONSULTANTS

Senator INOUE. Thank you.

I would like to ask Mr. Tomlinson a few questions. Do you believe it is legal or appropriate for the chairman of the board, CPB board, to hire a consultant at Federal funds in excess of \$14,000 without the consultation or approval of the board?

Mr. TOMLINSON. Senator Inouye, I observed every procedure that I had seen used over my 5 years on the board in the hiring of this consultant. These decisions were made in the CPB front office. I went to the president of CPB, I went to the general counsel. I asked that this contract be handled like any consultant's contract through the business office. It was handled by the general counsel.

In my 5 years on the board, the board had never been asked about contracts. I certainly was not trying to hide this from the board and I would have taken it to the board in a minute if anyone had pointed to me that this should have been done.

Senator INOUE. In the case of Mr. Mann, did you get the approval of Ms. Mitchell?

Mr. TOMLINSON. I am CPB. She is PBS. I got the approval of the president of CPB, the general counsel, and the business office. The consultant's contract was handled no different—

Senator INOUE. The law does not require you to consult with the board?

Mr. TOMLINSON. No, sir. I was certainly not trying to hide it from the board and if I had known of any tradition that the board should be involved I certainly would have involved the board.

CPB POLLING

Senator INOUE. There are also press reports that allege that you refused to make public CPB's own research that had been conducted by two polling firms, Terrence Group and the Lake Snell and Perry Associates.

Mr. TOMLINSON. That is simply not true. On the day that charge was made, you could go to the CPB website and find all the results of these polls.

Senator INOUE. Well, I am giving you the opportunity.

Mr. TOMLINSON. Yes, sir. I appreciate it.

We also share the friendship of Mary Bitterman, who did an outstanding job at Voice of America and has done an outstanding job for public broadcasting.

CPB USE OF CONSULTANTS

Senator INOUE. Did you use \$15,000 of taxpayers' funds to hire two Republican lobbyists without the knowledge of the board to defeat amendments to the reauthorization bill?

Mr. TOMLINSON. The board was stunned to discover that there was a serious proposal in the authorization process to require that four of our nine members come from the community of public broadcasters. The board unanimously opposed this. We have a very small staff relative to other agencies at CPB. Our legislative person was on vacation when we made this discovery. Our leadership, the leadership, again our president, general counsel, were involved in hiring at least three consultants to help us communicate, determine what the situation was on Capitol Hill in that time frame.

I was an indirect part of the process. The decision again was made by the chain of command.

JOURNAL EDITORIAL REPORT

Senator INOUE. Is it appropriate for the chairman of the board to secure private funding from the corporate world for the "Journal Editorial Report" hosted by Mr. Paul Gigot?

Mr. TOMLINSON. The decision to add Paul Gigot and the "Wall Street Journal Editorial Report" was one that involved a lot of people at both PBS and CPB. It was a decision that I saw no opposition to, and I was not directly involved in negotiating any contracts involving it.

Senator INOUE. You had no role to play in that?

Mr. TOMLINSON. I certainly thought it was a good idea and I thought it was an important idea because of the importance of having balance in current affairs broadcasting. I would never have put the Wall Street Journal show on alone. Again, as Senator Stevens said, no biases; make it neutral, make it common sense. If you have a liberal show, have a conservative show, one in the middle. If you have a conservative show, have a liberal show.

This is to me common sense and it is good for public broadcasting.

Senator INOUE. So your position is that these press reports are false?

Mr. TOMLINSON. The press reports, yes, sir.

Senator INOUE. Thank you.

Senator SPECTER. Thank you, Senator Inouye.

Senator Durbin.

"NOW WITH BILL MOYERS"

Senator DURBIN. Mr. Tomlinson, I am going to follow up on that. So let me understand what you are saying. You had to get "Now" off the air because of liberal advocacy—

Mr. TOMLINSON. No, no. I never wanted to take "Now" off the air.

Senator DURBIN. No pressure on Mr. Moyers?

Mr. TOMLINSON. No, no, sir. No, sir. In fact, if I had put pressure on Mr. Moyers you know exactly the way Mr. Moyers would have responded.

Senator DURBIN. So let me ask you this question. Mr. Moyers has said that when rumors began to circulate regarding hiring a con-

sultant to monitor his show he tried three times to meet with the CPB board to hear their concerns and answer their questions three times, and every time he was refused. So let me ask you to clarify then. If you had no axe to grind with Mr. Moyers, no problem with Mr. Moyers, why is it he could not get to meet with you?

Mr. TOMLINSON. Well, I did have a problem with his show. In terms of at the time—and I would have to go back and reconstruct about his requests to meet with us. At the time I remember discussing it with the president of CPB and he did not think it was appropriate to have such a meeting because our purpose—you are not going to change Bill Moyers. He has got a wonderful record of public service, but you are not going to change the politics of Bill Moyers, nor were you going to change the politics of that show. Frankly, I did not want to change the politics of—

Senator DURBIN. Well, I wish you would check, because he said he tried to reach out to you three times and could not get a meeting.

The point I want to get to is this. Assume for a second this was, as you called it, liberal advocacy on the “Now” show. Now we have something from the Wall Street Journal. Would you call that conservative advocacy?

Mr. TOMLINSON. Yes.

Senator DURBIN. Would you?

Mr. TOMLINSON. Yes.

Senator DURBIN. Okay.

Mr. TOMLINSON. So now we have a 30-minute show, a successor to Moyers’ called “Now,” and a 30-minute Wall Street Journal show. That is balanced.

Senator DURBIN. You do not expect within the content of each show that there be a balanced presentation, or do you?

Mr. TOMLINSON. No, I do not think that is realistic. I am old school. I think you should have the kind of programming that gives you back and forth. I think that you should have liberals and conservatives on these shows and let the viewer decide.

Senator DURBIN. I guess what troubles me then is why you had to put this pressure on Mr. Moyers. I do not understand that. If you just wanted to put a conservative show on next to him, you could have done that all along.

Mr. TOMLINSON. I do not quite understand how I put pressure on Mr. Moyers.

Senator DURBIN. You do not think you put any pressure on Mr. Moyers?

Mr. TOMLINSON. No, no. In fact, I think if I had he would have responded in kind. He does not respond well to pressure.

VOICE OF AMERICA

Senator DURBIN. Let me say that you made some references to your service at the Voice of America quite a few years ago and also the fact that it was referred to in Mr. Moyers’ speech. I would like to make sure the record reflects that Mr. Moyers said this about your service at Voice of America and the controversy involving Mr. Frick, and I quote Mr. Moyers’ speech:

“Let me be clear about this. There is no record apparently of what Ken Tomlinson did. We don’t know whether he supported or

protested the blacklisting of many American liberals or what he thinks of it now."

That is a direct quote from his speech. So I do not know if that is all of the things that he said there, but that was included in his remarks.

If I might ask you, too——

Mr. TOMLINSON. There was an earlier reference that linked me to——

"NOW WITH BILL MOYERS"

Senator DURBIN. That you were working there at the time Mr. Frick was involved in some of these activities, that is true.

Let me ask you this. The board leadership, you say in your testimony: "The board leadership of PBS recognized that Friday evening programming should reflect different points of view. When it was clear that PBS was following through on its commitment, I ended the Mann study and did not make it public because to do so would have called attention to the fact that for nearly 2 years public broadcasting ignored our legal responsibility for presenting diverse viewpoints on controversial views."

I am trying to follow what you are saying here. Without your study—in other words, without your study alleging liberal bias in PBS programming, people would not have noticed it? Is that what you are saying?

Mr. TOMLINSON. I did not need a study to document that the Moyers program was biased.

Senator DURBIN. Then why did you pay Frederick Mann 14,000 taxpayers' dollars?

Mr. TOMLINSON. Because I was facing people, not unlike you, who were saying at the time: Gee, there is nothing wrong with the Moyers program; this program is balanced. Statistically—you know, Warner Wolf used to say: "Let's go to the videotape." We took 6 months of Moyers programs and demonstrated that it was left wing advocacy journalism.

As I said, it is outstanding stuff. He is a great broadcaster. But the show was biased from the left.

Senator DURBIN. I do not understand how this gentleman is competent to make that conclusion, and some of the things that he characterizes on here are clearly off the wall. But at the risk of——

Mr. TOMLINSON. He had, for example, Bob Barr, a Republican former Congressman, was on the Moyers show to attack the Patriot Act. He was not on the Moyers show to take any of his traditional positions.

Senator DURBIN. Sounds pretty balanced to me.

Mr. TOMLINSON. He was on the show to balance the Patriot Act. That is how he got on the show. Conservatives and Republicans got on the Moyers show by and large when they took positions which agreed with Mr. Moyers.

Senator DURBIN. Are you familiar with the fact that the bill to reform the Patriot Act is co-sponsored by me and Senator Larry Craig.

Mr. TOMLINSON. Well, I certainly welcome reform of anything, Senator. I am just talking about journalism here.

Senator DURBIN. That is what I am talking about, too.

Mr. TOMLINSON. I am talking about how he came to be on that show.

Senator DURBIN. Ms. Harrison, are you familiar with Bill Moyers' program? Did you watch it?

Ms. HARRISON. I have to admit I have not. I have been working 24-7 in my previous job. But I guess I should let you ask the question before I answer a question you have not asked yet.

PATRICIA HARRISON BACKGROUND

Senator DURBIN. I just want to try to understand your familiarity with Corporation for Public Broadcasting, NPR, PBS.

Ms. HARRISON. I understand the mission and that we have two tracks here. One is to ensure that public broadcasting is not pressured or interfered with by the Federal Government in any way or the board. The other mission is to ensure that there are a diversity of views.

I do believe in just looking at a lot of material in the last several days that one of the answers to this—and I too would like to get back to the mission of public broadcasting—is the Office of the Ombudsman, an independent office. They really have no authority to pre-censor, to censor, but they just do what many ombudsmen do for newspapers, and to take it out of this whole controversial range and have it as something that is just ongoing; I know PBS has their own ombudsman, and to start focusing on the real issue here, which is the importance of public broadcasting.

Senator DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, if I could ask one last question of Ms. Harrison.

Ms. HARRISON. Yes.

Senator DURBIN. If we matched up our résumés, very few things would come out the same, but—

Ms. HARRISON. I have a feeling where you are going.

Senator DURBIN. But it would demonstrate that we are both political animals. We both from our partisan perspectives have been pretty actively involved in our partisan beliefs. Clearly the concern over what is happening with Mr. Tomlinson is that we are politicizing public broadcasting, and the fear is now that if it reaches the point where the average viewer, who now thinks so highly of public broadcasting by radio or television, begins to believe that it has now been taken over by people with a political agenda, who want to spare this administration or any administration of criticism, who want to make certain that those who are the most effective advocates for one point of view are silenced or diminished, it is going to really tear at the heart of what is good about public broadcasting.

Now, you come in with a strong Republican résumé. I in the same spot would have a strong Democratic résumé. The obvious question is, can you put this aside? Do you feel like you have got water to carry here for the White House and the administration in this new position?

Ms. HARRISON. That is a three-part question and it is actually a very important question. First, let me say before I am a member of any party I am an American. For the last 4 years, as I alluded to, I ran a bureau. During that period of time the OIG did its first review in 50 years of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Af-

fairs. I am very proud of the fact that what they found was that my leadership style, my management style, was inclusive, I am a team-builder.

I have a track record in the private sector. Running a company, I could not tell you who is Republican and Democrat. When I take on, let me just call this a mission, I am looking at best achievable outcome and I think about the last day that I am going to be on the job. I have a strong enough ego to want to say because I took this job the entity, the organization, was stronger than before I came here.

I am committed to this. Without going into braggadocio too much, I did have other opportunities, but I believe in the mission of public broadcasting. And I believe that the people who are concerned need to not only listen to what I say, but to watch what I do. I am going to fight for this. I am here fighting for this budget. I am now the CEO of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and I know what my clear mission is.

I fought for similar things. One of the reasons I wanted to do this, Senator, is I find a similar mission that I had at the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, where people look at exchanges and say, why do we need those people coming here. Basically, these things are the things that are really going to connect our country.

I do not know what else to say. I was president of Capital Press Women. I have been an advocate for women. I founded an organization, National Women's Economic Alliance. I have written two books really focused on helping women. I feel confident that I am a fair person, that I have a great deal of integrity, and that nobody owns me ever. Plus I come from Brooklyn, New York, and I am an Italian-American.

Senator DURBIN. I have a daughter living in Brooklyn now. Maybe she is picking up some of the same attributes.

Thank you to the panel. Mr. Chairman, thank you for your patience.

CPB USE OF CONSULTANTS

Senator SPECTER. Senator Durbin, I thought you would not have any question after that last response.

Mr. Tomlinson, the New York Times has reported a couple of payments, one for a lobbyist, \$10,000 into the insights of a specific Senator. Is that true?

Mr. TOMLINSON. I described that situation a moment ago and with your indulgence I would like to go over how we got to that point.

Senator SPECTER. Go ahead.

Mr. TOMLINSON. Our board discovered that there were interests in public broadcasting which wanted to put into the authorization bill language which would have required four of our members come from the public broadcasting community. The board was very concerned about this. We were unanimously opposed to this. When our board members, including our Democrats, called counterparts on Capitol Hill, they discovered quite a lot of work had gone into this on the part of the public broadcasting community.

We have a small staff at CPB. Our legislative person the week we discovered this was on vacation. Our front office turned and hired to my knowledge, or at least had three—brought in three different consultants to work that bill, to try to get to Capitol Hill—

Senator SPECTER. Mr. Tomlinson, that is all very interesting, but why pay \$10,000 to find insights into a Senator? Why not your picking up the phone and talking to him or going to pay him a visit, and save \$10,000 on a very tight budget?

Mr. TOMLINSON. If our legislative person had been in town that week, that might have been the direction we would have gone.

Senator SPECTER. Well, you had some protracted period of time to make the contact, did you not?

Mr. TOMLINSON. Yes.

Senator DURBIN. Do you not think the Senator would be a lot more impressed by having you in your position come talk to him, giving him your reasons, than the amorphous approach of somebody seeking insights into his background?

Mr. TOMLINSON. Absolutely. But the reason CPB has traditionally hired these consultants is because we have a small core staff and we tend to turn to the outside for help in these areas.

Senator DURBIN. And \$5,000 being paid to provide advice on the legislative process for a month, without having talking to any of the lawmakers; is that also accurate?

Mr. TOMLINSON. Yes, although we—because this thing was sprung on us overnight. Our board, both Democrats and Republicans, we were absolutely unaware that for apparently weeks leaders in public broadcasting had been working to require that four of our nine members be drawn from the public broadcasting community. We did not think that was right.

Senator SPECTER. Well, Mr. Tomlinson, when we see reports in the press about that and then have them confirmed by you, it raises a question at least in my mind as to the propriety of the expenditures. We Senators see a lot of people and I would repeat that if a man in your position came to see a Senator I think it would bear a lot more weight, or even a telephone call.

So as a little guidance to the future, when you are short on budget to bear that in mind.

Mr. Boaz, do you think that public broadcasting ought to take any further steps to seek the avoidance of what you consider to be political bias?

Mr. BOAZ. I think it is valuable to seek to avoid the bias, and I do think if you look at the examples—there is this report nobody has mentioned, that appeared in the newspaper "Current," the newspaper of public TV and radio, not by a conservative, that goes through looking at Bill Moyers show and points out several examples of heavy bias on the issues that mattered a lot to Mr. Moyers.

One way you balance that is by having different programs there. I do not think the addition of the "Wall Street Journal Editorial Report" is going to balance the overall thrust of prime time programming on PBS.

But as I say, I do believe that it is impossible to choose the topics and choose the speakers and choose the angles without having some perspective involved, and that is why, rather than seek political balance, put a Republican onto the CPB board, put a Repub-

lican somewhere into NPR or PBS, the better thing is to depoliticize the system, take it out of politics entirely.

My guess is that public radio and television might be more adventurous if they did not have a Republican administration and a Republican Congress looking over their shoulders. Some people would remember a few years ago when PBS broadcast "Tales of the City" and there was a lot of controversy because this was a fictional program that had some gay characters and some drugs involved in it. They decided not to do more "Tales of the City." The commercial network Showtime picked it up and nobody complained, because it was not taxpayers' money, it was not an official government imprimatur, and we understand that in a free society Showtime can pretty much show what it wants to.

So I think if you depoliticize you will avoid this problem of getting two ombudsmen or a new chairman, a new president. You take it completely out of the realm of politics.

Senator SPECTER. Ms. Mitchell, do you think there is any substance at all to Mr. Boaz's contention of political bias on the public broadcasting?

Ms. MITCHELL. The public opinion polls certainly substantiate our firm conviction that we are producing a schedule that meets our editorial standards and that meets the obligations of fairness and balance.

Might I also respond to something else I think you asked?

Senator SPECTER. Before you go on to another subject, I do not think that is quite responsive to my question. My question was do you think there is any basis for Mr. Boaz's contention that there is political bias on public broadcasting?

Ms. MITCHELL. We take every allegation of that very seriously. Last year, out of 3,000 hours there were less than 30 hours that rose to what we would consider any kind of question or controversy. But 2 years ago we looked at our editorial standards and said they need to be updated, we need to be very clear with our producers what we expect from them in terms of fairness and objectivity, accuracy, and transparency. So we clarified it.

Senator SPECTER. Is your answer no?

Ms. MITCHELL. The answer is we work very hard to ensure that there is not, and when there is an opinion or a point of view, Senator, we are very clear that that is what the viewer is hearing; it is someone's point of view, someone's commentary.

Senator SPECTER. Okay, I interpret that to mean possibly. To the extent that there is any possible bias, what you are saying is that you take every step you can to eliminate it?

Ms. MITCHELL. In dealing with controversial issues, we require of our producers that they do the most thorough, accurate, transparent process to examine—and we take on the complex issues, Mr. Chairman, as you know, many of which are not taken on by mainstream media. We do not attempt, except in our news programs, to balance everything within a segment or within a program, because that is what the law requires, and we believe that there is a better understanding and comprehension if you do it over a series of programs.

But we take very seriously any charge that our programs are not representing the diversity of perspectives in this country. We think

of ourselves as a big tent where a Bill Moyers and a Paul Gigot and a Travis Smiley and a Gwen Eifel all are welcome.

Senator SPECTER. Ms. Harrison, do you have anything you would like to add? We are about to conclude the hearing.

Ms. HARRISON. Just very briefly. There are some mechanisms in place, because public broadcasting, the word most important is the "public." So there is a toll-free number where viewers and listeners can call in. We direct them also to connected links. We have a very vigorous e-mail program.

So we are hearing from viewers and listeners all the time, and these are remarks and observations that are not just dismissed. I am very busy answering my own enormous mail right now and I have to tell you the interesting thing is I am getting about the same degree from people saying it is too left and the same degree it is too right, concerns on both sides. I think we have a very passionate listener and viewer audience, and I think the Office of the Ombudsman is a good step.

Senator SPECTER. Mr. Lawson, anything you care to add?

Mr. LAWSON. Yes, sir. My association was the author of the amendment in question that prompted Mr. Tomlinson to hire the two lobbyists. That just speaks to the need for—

Mr. TOMLINSON. I did not hire the lobbyists, John. They were hired by the front office.

Mr. LAWSON. Mr. Chairman, it just speaks to the need for greater transparency in the way that CPB operates. We would like to pick up the conversation we had with the Senate Commerce Committee last year and the rest of Congress to work out some reforms to the way CPB operates.

Senator SPECTER. Mr. Tomlinson, awaiting the Moyers-Tomlinson debate, do you have anything else to add now?

Mr. TOMLINSON. No, Mr. Chairman. Thank you so much for your support of public broadcasting.

Senator SPECTER. Mr. Boaz, we will give you the last word if you want it.

Mr. BOAZ. I feel like Daniel in the lion's den. But I am glad to have the last word. I believe that the controversies that—

Senator SPECTER. Daniel did not do too badly and neither have you.

Mr. BOAZ. I believe the controversies that we are discussing are an illustration of the problem I raised, that it is inevitable that you are going to have politicization if you have government funding. That is why I think public radio and television would be better off without government funding.

ADDITIONAL SUBMITTED STATEMENT

Senator SPECTER. We have received an additional submitted statement that will be included in the record at this point.

[The statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF AMERICANS FOR THE ARTS

On behalf of Americans for the Arts, I am pleased to provide you this statement in support of funding for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB). As you know, recently the fiscal year 2006 funding for CPB was threatened during House subcommittee consideration. The House bill was substantially improved during full

committee debate and floor action, but it is still inadequate. I write to you today to ask for your support in keeping CPB fully funded.

Americans for the Arts is the service organization for the nation's 4,000 local arts agencies, which provide \$1 billion of annual funding and support for the arts and humanities at the local level. It is important to note at the outset that many local arts agencies are important partners, and funders, of local public television and radio stations. We are asking the federal government to continue to honor its commitment to public broadcasting, just as local arts agencies continue to honor theirs.

CPB supports public television and radio through its partners, the Public Broadcasting Service (PBS) and National Public Radio (NPR). These organizations provide important access to the arts for millions of Americans. With both community-based arts programming, and nationally televised shows such as "On Stage at the Kennedy Center" and "Austin City Limits," public broadcasting is often a primary source of arts programming in many rural parts of the country. Public broadcasting also serves as an important source of information about live arts performances and exhibitions. Any reduction to its budget would drastically reduce the access that many Americans have to the arts.

Public broadcasting's national programs are probably well known to members of the Committee. While you are probably familiar also with local programming in your own state, I would like to provide a few examples of local arts programming from around the country.

- In Pittsburgh, WQED, the nation's first community-owned television station, airs "Performance in Pittsburgh" featuring recorded-in Pittsburgh concert highlights as well as interviews with Pittsburgh musicians and presenters. The WQED-FM, the radio station produces "Pittsburgh Symphony Radio" presenting the Pittsburgh Symphony Orchestra's recent concerts at Heinz Hall, archival tapes and tour performances.
- Iowa Public Television (IPT) has a show named, "A Century of Iowa Architecture," which uses high definition cameras to capture the details and drama behind the construction and design of Iowa's most significant buildings. Also, as part of its School-to-Careers programming IPT has programming specifically on becoming an artist. The National Employer Leadership Council (NELC) highlighted Iowa Public Television in its publication Best Practices in School-to-Careers: Rural Issues.
- The Mississippi Arts Council and Mississippi Public Broadcasting produced a seven-part radio show titled, "Sounds From Around the Corner" which included gospel and old-time fiddling, as well as more recent immigrant traditions such as Latino music and classical Indian singing—all performed by Mississippi artists.
- In Alaska, CPB has provided funding for the weekly "AK" cultural magazine show produced by the Alaska Public Radio Network. In 2003, Public Radio News Directors International voted AK second place nationally for "Best Public Affairs Program".

Budget cuts would heavily impact public radio broadcasting, as CPB funding represents 15 percent of the budget for many individual member stations of NPR. If they lose that support, many of them will have to make severe cuts to their programming and local services. This will especially impact rural areas and stations serving minority populations, as they heavily rely on federal funding for their operating budgets. While local and state arts agencies also support these stations, they could not make up for a loss of federal funding on this scale.

While the House partially restored CPB funding, its legislation, as passed, eliminated \$39 million to help local stations switch to digital transmission, \$40 million to upgrade aging satellite technology, and made a \$23 million cut to the "Ready to Learn" program, which provides money for the creation of shows such as "Sesame Street" and "Reading Rainbow." These are all important items for CPB operations. We hope you will fully fund these programs in your subcommittee consideration, and that you will fight for them in conference with the House.

With your leadership, we can insure that CPB funding is adequately funded, and that public television and radio can continue to provide high quality arts and cultural programming to our nation.

CONCLUSION OF HEARINGS

Senator SPECTER. Thank you all very much for coming in. Let me tell you, drawing four Senators on a Monday morning in Washington is high praise for this panel and this subject. That concludes our hearings.

[Whereupon, at 12:39 p.m., Monday, July 11, the hearings were concluded, and the subcommittee was recessed, to reconvene subject to the call of the Chair.]